PORTLAND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

DATE: February 23, 2011

TO: Board of Commissioners

FROM: Bruce A. Warner, Executive Director

SUBJECT: Report Number 11-14

Gateway Business Development Strategy

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

BOARD ACTION REQUESTED

None — information only.

SUMMARY

This report will update the Portland Development Commission (PDC) Board of Commissioners (Board) on the results of the Gateway Business Development Strategy (BDS). The Board will hear three recommendations regarding how to best encourage job growth in the Gateway Regional Center Urban Renewal Area (URA), including:

- 1. Create a Gateway promotional campaign;
- 2. Design and implement a business recruitment campaign, targeting specific industries and opportunity sites; and
- 3. Create a stronger sense of community by clustering neighborhood retail and services along the Halsey/Weidler couplet corridor.

BACKGROUND

In 1995, the Gateway district was designated as a Regional Center in Metro's 2040 Growth Concept, which envisioned the area as a hub of employment and housing served by high capacity transit. In 2001, the Gateway Regional Center Urban Renewal Area (URA) was established, drawing a boundary around 660 acres to form a tax increment district capable of financing up to \$164 million for public improvements through 2022.

Since the Regional Center designation and the creation of the URA, there have been some success stories in employment growth, but there is still considerable work to be done. The Gateway Business Development Strategy is one of the first pilot programs testing and implementing the Draft City of Portland Neighborhood Economic Development Action Plan that will come before the City Council and PDC Board of Commissioners this winter/spring.

In 2010, PDC, in coordination with Metro and the Portland Bureau of Planning and Sustainability, conducted a Gateway Business Development Strategy to:

- Assess Gateway's progress in transforming into a high job-density Regional Center;
- Determine how to grow existing businesses, attract new business, and create jobs;
- Determine the most effective tools and resources to grow businesses in the area; and

• Develop an implementation plan for the public and private sector to follow to achieve this.

A consulting team led by Applied Development Economics (ADE) focused their work on the following key questions:

- What are baseline economic conditions in Gateway?
- What are the types of businesses for which Gateway would be a good location and why?
- What are the barriers to the growth of these businesses and jobs in Gateway?
- What are the best strategies to support business and job growth in Gateway and its transformation into a high job-density regional center?

Following are the three strategies staff recommends PDC and the City of Portland pursue to affect job growth in Gateway:

1. Create a Gateway promotional campaign.

In interviews with Gateway business owners and real estate brokers, the ADE team found that Gateway suffers from a lack of "brand," or "there-there." Just as most people in the Portland region do not inherently know where Gateway is located, brokers may not be familiar with the business and real estate development opportunities. PDC and the City must find a better way to communicate business opportunities to employers and brokers that otherwise dismiss Gateway. This could be a low-cost, high-profile campaign that proactively engages the brokerage community, uses press releases to communicate project activity, and encourages internal PDC Business and Industry staff to pitch Gateway locations in their outreach work.

2. Design and implement a business recruitment campaign, targeting specific industries and opportunity sites.

The ADE team inventoried all businesses in Gateway to better understand the industry mix. Gateway has a significant concentration of medical-related businesses, from Adventist Medical Center (Gateway's largest employer), to the Oregon Clinic, to numerous smaller providers of medical services scattered throughout the URA. These businesses benefit from Gateway's freeway and MAX access and aging local population. ADE also found that Gateway could be an attractive location for professional services, call centers, and clean tech employers, several of which are already located in the URA. With its regional accessibility, flexible zoning, and proximity to the airport, Gateway is poised to capitalize on this competitive advantage. However, PDC and the City must target growth and recruitment efforts in these industries.

Finally, the potential Gateway Education Center, a shared facility offering space for classrooms and programs to local educational institutions, could offer unique partnerships with workforce providers, employers, and non-profit organizations serving East Portlanders. PDC will continue to perform financial feasibility and organizational commitment analysis.

3. Create a stronger sense of community by clustering neighborhood retail and services along the Halsey/Weidler couplet corridor.

The Halsey/Weidler corridor effectively serves as Gateway's "Main Street". Not only is Halsey/Weidler the most walkable corridor in the URA, with dozens of local businesses and storefronts, the Gateway Area Business Association (GABA) plays an active role

networking, conducting business outreach, and hosting regular member meetings. In addition to this built-in social infrastructure, PDC and the City of Portland control a significant redevelopment opportunity at NE 106th Avenue & Halsey Street. Investing in the Gateway Redevelopment, Urban Plaza, and Neighborhood Park will dramatically transform the appearance of the Halsey/Weidler corridor, bring much-needed open space to the district, and provide a mixed-use, commercial redevelopment opportunity fronting Halsey.

PDC conducted the BDS in partnership with the community to ensure that PDC actions and investments enhance livability and economic opportunity within the URA. The BDS was co-sponsored by leaders from PDC (Erin Flynn), the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability (Susan Anderson), and Metro (Robin MacArthur).

The Citizens Advisory Committee attended three meetings and provided valuable input into the proposed strategies. The BDS was also supported by a multi-bureau Technical Advisory Committee that met three times to help refine the analysis and recommendations. Following are the committee member rosters:

| Deanna Bitar, Bitar Property Management | Tim Brunner, Axis Design | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| Teri Bunker, Bridge City Family Medical Clinic | Kristin Erickson, Oregon Clinic | | | |
| Ted Gilbert, Gateway PAC & Property Owner | Ken Grimes, PacTrust | | | |
| Nadine Jones, Outer Rim Bicycles | Shawn Klinkner, Adventist Medical Center | | | |
| Larry Kotan (Troy Wilkerson – Alternate), | Tom Mahoney, The Colour Authority & | | | |
| East Portland Action Plan | Gateway Area Business Association | | | |
| Denise Pratt, McTavish Shortbread | Fred Sanchez, Realty Brokers | | | |
| John Sygielski (Deborah Higa – Alternate), | | | | |
| Mt. Hood Community College | | | | |

Citizens Advisory Committee

Technical Advisory Committee

| Steve Kountz, Bureau of Planning & | Christina Scarzello, Bureau of Planning & |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Sustainability | Sustainability |
| Ric Vrana, TriMet | Chris Yake, Metro |

PDC staff has already begun working on an action plan that will prioritize several of the strategies, assigning staff, budget, and partners. Subsequently, staff will unveil the action plan to local and regional business leaders in spring and summer 2011 in a coordinated outreach campaign. It is anticipated that these prioritized strategies will guide resources and investments in the five year budget process.

ATTACHMENT:

A. Gateway URA Budget

Five-Year Forecast Project Requirements

FY 2010-11 FY 2011-12 FY 2012-13 FY 2013-14 FY 2014-15 FY 2015-16

| Gate | way Regional Center URA | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---|---------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| Resou | | | | | | | |
| Begi | inning Fund Balance | 2,294,762 | 1,018,532 | 1,012,156 | 323,063 | 148,539 | 1,908,592 |
| | eral and Other Grants | 208,500 | 208,500 | 0 | 150,000 | 150,000 | 150,000 |
| Interest on Investments | | 1,000 | 7,000 | 8,000 | 9,000 | 2,000 | 2,000 |
| Loan Collections Reimbursements | | 18,402 | 18,402 | 14,478 | 10,555 | 10,555 | 10,555 |
| TIF Proceeds | | 80,000 2,781,691 | 0 3,977,922 | 0 9,979,530 | 0 3,303,022 | 0 2,617,498 | 0 133,860 |
| | Fund Resources | 5,384,355 | 5,230,356 | 11,014,164 | 3,795,640 | 2,928,592 | 2,205,007 |
| | | -,, | -,, | ,, | -,, | _,, | _,, |
| | rements | | | | | | |
| | gram Expenditures | | | | | | |
| 4 | Administration Finance | | | | | | |
| | H98001 Debt Management | 10,000 | 10,000 | 10,000 | 10,000 | 10,000 | 10,000 |
| | Administration Total | 10,000 | 10,000 | 10,000 | 10,000 | 10,000 | 10,000 |
| E | Business Development | , | , | , | , | , | , |
| | High Growth | | | | | | |
| | H79020 Business Finance | 37,500 | 37,500 | 37,500 | 37,500 | 37,500 | 37,500 |
| | Industry Cluster | | | | | | |
| | H28069 Lean Manufacturing | 0 | 25,000 | 25,000 | 25,000 | 25,000 | 0 |
| | H72026 Cluster Development | 0 | 200,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 |
| | H79020 Business Finance H79100 Site Recruitment | 37,500 0 | 37,500 | 37,500 | 37,500 | 37,500 0 | 37,500 0 |
| | Neighborhood Economic Development | U | 14,250 | 14,250 | 14,250 | 0 | 0 |
| | H79020 Business Finance | 75,000 | 75,000 | 75,000 | 75,000 | 75,000 | 75,000 |
| | H79060 Business Development | 150,000 | 150,000 | 150,000 | 150,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 |
| | Business Development Total | 300,000 | 539,250 | 439,250 | 439,250 | 375,000 | 350,000 |
| F | lousing | | | | | | |
| | Multi-Family - For Sale | | | | | | |
| | H20017 Ventura Park | 0 | 75,000 | 300,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | H89034 Gateway/Glisan | 0 | 500,000 | 5,500,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | H89035 Homeownership Development Multi-Family - Rental Housing | 400,000 | 0 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 0 | 0 |
| | H20017 Ventura Park | 21,619 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | H89034 Gateway/Glisan | 25,000 | 14,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Housing Total | 446,619 | 589,000 | 5,900,000 | 100,000 | 0 | 0 |
| li li | nfrastructure | | | | | | |
| | Facilities | | | | | | |
| | H14392 Receiving Center Property | 83,000 | 2,000 | 2,000 | 2,000 | 2,000 | 2,000 |
| | Parks | 05.000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | H14387 Neighborhood Park Transportation | 85,000 | U | U | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | H14389 Central Gateway Redevelopment | 525,000 | 883,000 | 120,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Strategy | | , | | | | |
| | H14394 Gateway Transit Center | 5,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Infrastructure Total | 698,000 | 885,000 | 122,000 | 2,000 | 2,000 | 2,000 |
| • | Property Redevelopment Plans and Strategies - Revitalization | | | | | | |
| | H14403 Gateway Community Outreach | 3,000 | 3,000 | 3,000 | 3,000 | 3,000 | 3,000 |
| | Redevelopment | -, | -, | -, | -, | -, | -, |
| | H14390 Mixed Use Development/Acquisition | 2,010,000 | 615,000 | 1,685,000 | 1,985,000 | 10,000 | 540,000 |
| | H27001 Storefront Grants | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 50,000 |
| | H27050 DOS Grants | 100,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 | 25,000 | 50,000 |
| | H28030 Redevelopment Loan Projects | 250,000 | 250,000 | 500,000 | 250,000 | 250,000 | 0 |
| | H79025 Green Business Grants | 0 | 75,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 75,000 | 50,000 |
| Tet | Property Redevelopment Total | 2,463,000 | 1,093,000 | 2,438,000 | 2,488,000 | 463,000 | 693,000 |
| 100 | al Program Expenditures | 3,917,619 | 3,116,250 | 8,909,250 | 3,039,250 | 850,000 | 1,055,000 |
| Per | sonal Services | 288,379 | 341,837 | 320,733 | 109,413 | 30,600 | 37,980 |
| Tra | nsfers - Indirect | 934,511 | 671,447 | 1,229,477 | 419,417 | 117,300 | 145,590 |
| | | | | | 70.004 | | |
| PH | B Staff/Admin | 111,826 | 88,666 | 231,641 | 79,021 | 22,100 | 27,430 |
| Tot | al Fund Expenditures | 5,252,335 | 4,218,200 | 10,691,101 | 3,647,101 | 1,020,000 | 1,266,000 |
| Cor | ntingency | 132,020 | 1,012,156 | 323,063 | 148,539 | 1,908,592 | 939,007 |
| | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| End | ding Fund Balance | | | U | U | | |
| Total | Requirements | 5,384,355 | 5,230,356 | 11,014,164 | 3,795,640 | 2,928,592 | 2,205,007 |
| | | | | | | | |