

# Willamette Falls

◦ LEGACY PROJECT ◦

## PARTNERS GROUP QUARTERLY MEETING AGENDA

June 24, 2020

9:00 – 10:30 a.m.

Virtual meeting (Zoom)

Time	Topic	Lead Presenter
9:00 – 9:10 P.M.	Welcome & Introductions	Brian Moore Metro (facilitating)
9:10 – 9:45 A.M.	Project Status Update	Brian Moore Metro
9:45 – 10:25 A.M.	Roundtable Partners Group Updates	Partners
10:25 – 10:30 A.M.	Next Steps and Closing Business	Brian Moore Metro (facilitating)

Note: Public testimony will not be heard at this meeting; however, the Willamette Falls Legacy Project always accepts written comments. Email [info@willamettefallslegacy.org](mailto:info@willamettefallslegacy.org)

# Willamette Falls

## ◦ LEGACY PROJECT ◦

### PARTNERS GROUP MEETING MINUTES

June 24<sup>th</sup>, 2020

*Zoom*

9-10:30 AM.

#### Partner Attendees

**Oregon City:** Mayor Dan Holladay, Commissioner Frank O'Donnell, Tony Konkol

**Metro:** Councilor Christine Lewis, Councilor Juan Carlos Gonzalez, COO Marissa Madrigal

**County:** Commissioner Paul Savas, Commissioner Martha Schrader

**State:** Representative Mark Meek, Metro Regional Solutions Coordinator Raihana Ansary, State Parks Deputy Director M.G. Devereux

**Absent:** Senator Alan Olsen  
County Administrator Gary Schmidt

**Public:** Denise Harvey, Torey Wakeland, Laura Terway, Gary Sheperd, Alexis Ingram, Stacia Hernandez, James Graham, Carrie Belding, Elena Baranes, Emily Klepper, Michael Karnosh, Andrew Mason, Laura Zentner, Kristin Brown, Tracy Moreland, Jennifer Donnelly, Jon Blasher, Jovian Davis, Brian Moore, Alex Gilbertson, Nathaniel Corum, Ramona Perrault

**The Willamette Falls Legacy Project Partners meeting was called to order by Brian Moore at 9:10 AM.**

This is the quarterly partners meeting for June 24, for the purpose of project updates and to answer questions the partners may have. No decisions anticipated.

Presentation by Brian Moore: Willamette Falls legacy Project: Current Status and Next Steps

Overview of project partners, site, and four core values

At our last partners meeting, we discussed financial challenges that our current project designs are facing

There are three options for advancing project, none currently have unanimous support

Overview of original approach to Phase 1: approach to get to phase 1 viewing area at the southwest corner of site, using main street with light improvements to access Mill H

Overview of Grand Ronde Phase 1 proposal: After Grande Ronde purchased the property, they indicated that they prefer not to use Main Street for interim public access, so they put

together a proposal for Phase 1 with a combination of new permanent and temporary features to access Mill H

WFLP financial status: The original approach to phase one more expensive than we had hoped.

When project started, partners identified 25 million for conceptual design and phase 1 of the project. Of that 25 million dollars, we have just under 15 million in hand, meaning that we have yet to receive from WFT a contribution of just under 6 million. That said, our relationship with trust is good, they've raised 7 million dollars to date and are prepared to contribute funds of at least 5.9 million dollars, pending phase 1 design. Need to know phase 1 approach in order to fundraise

We've spent most of Metro's contribution on conceptual design and getting the project through conceptual design to get to this point. We've reserved the funds from the state, 12.5 million, for construction. You'll notice that the funds on hand is greater, that's because the funds are restricted to construction, we haven't spent any funds on construction, and so the money has gained interest.

Remaining funds are \$276k in contributions from the property owner, a small amount from Clackamas County, and 700k remaining from Oregon City.

Total cash on hand for the project is \$15 mil.

Phase 1 Construction Cost Estimates:

Option 1: Mainstreet reduced scope, \$23 mil.

Option 2: Mainstreet expanded scope, \$33 mil.

Option 3: Riverfront approach, \$50 mil.

All three of these options don't include soft costs of 5-15 mil, depending on which approach is selected

We have a funding challenge because the original construction budget of \$12.5 mil is exceeded by all three Phase 1 options. We haven't closed the funding gap completely yet.

Issues to address:

- Update agreement WFT too reaffirm \$6 mil contribution.
- Identify a feasible Phase 1.
- Assurance from state that funding won't be taken away before we start.
- Establish a development agreement between Oregon City and CTGR regarding public infrastructure improvements, responsibilities as the property owner for

development of the site. It's the kind of agreement that would go into place between Oregon City and any developer of a property like this.

- Government-to-government agreement between Metro and CTGR. This is important because the way the project currently was negotiated, was in context of easement, and the easement didn't account for working with another government as the property owner. Important for Metro to work closely with CTGR, to establish a path forward with renegotiating the easement, while needing to maintain appropriate real estate interest in order to contribute funds to the development of the riverwalk.
- Select Phase 1 budget and schedule, coming to terms with what we're willing to contribute to Phase 1, and having some certainty regarding future phases of the project.

Questions:

Commissioner O'Donnell: What is the single largest factor in the \$17 mil cost increase if we choose the riverfront approach?

Brian Moore: If I had to distill it to a single factor, I would say that it would require two in-water work periods rather than one, needs more construction work in order to provide the access.

Stacia Hernandez: It would provide permanent access to the public that gets to an initial viewing platform, that would connect to your Phase 1 of the full build-out, you would have your full walkway and it wouldn't preclude future development

Commissioner O'Donnell: Is it the necessary construction of the bridge that adds to the cost?

Stacia Hernandez: Yes, the bridge and in-water work contributes significantly to cost.

Representative Meek: I just want to remind everyone of the gravity of our budget shortfall. Since these dollars don't have a clear path to move forward, in light of current economic situation. This would be a good project to start breaking ground. We are losing money on projects in similar situations. There's no imminent threat that I'm aware of but just my forecast.

Commissioner O'Donnell: My background is in project management, so I am wondering what is the single largest obstacle that we need to overcome to advance this project, and are we working on that?

Brian Moore: It's difficult to condense all the project's challenges to a single issue. That said, the financial cost of building a project is certainly one of the largest challenges the project faces. If a wand were waved and \$150 mil appeared, we could move forward not only with Phase 1, but future phases as well. Money doesn't grow on trees, so we have to identify an appropriate Phase 1 that meets the goals of the state funding, which means it

provides access to falls, providing prominent view in falls the whole way. If there is flexibility in those requirements based on opportunities to phase the project, maybe there's an opportunity to take on a bit less, and that's a decision for partners to make. I don't have a proposal with guarantees to get to viewpoint that would be feasible. We're currently working with CTGR to work through their concerns with our initial proposal, as well as our concerns with their proposal and the cost that their proposal. We hope to get to a phase one that gets a prominent view of the falls within budget, within a reasonable timeline.

Commissioner O'Donnell: I'm aware that it's difficult to work in a consortium where everyone's interests may not align, but without demonstrable progress, funding might fall by the wayside.

Commissioner Savas: Building on what Representative Meek had pointed out, I am concerned that if we don't make progress, the public will respond since we're spending their funds. We don't want to be at a standstill without progress, and when a project's budget goes up, we have to explain to public why. If we can't establish path forward, we need to report back. I don't know if other partners have anything to add, but we are approaching that time to report back.

Councilor Lewis: I would add that the timeline were on, we had a reset with change of landowner, and generally the public supports and understands that, but the narrative of how we move forward despite challenges is what I'm concerned with. As we see a funding gap, we need to be productive with those challenges. You mentioned opening the partners table to others, maybe the trust, (Councilor Lewis disclosed that she sits on the board of trust), what are next steps there to align visions and work on that relationships, since they have identified funds and have a vision themselves?

Brian Moore: The project is clarifying roles and responsibilities internally. Willamette Falls Trust's question about their long term role is significant for the partners to consider. I'll do whatever work partners recommend in evaluating the partners table, and what it means to be a partner. In the past we've said partners need to contribute a significant amount of funds, and the Trust is prepared to do so. This also opens up the question of the long term role of CTGR and what financial commitments that they might make.

Councilor Lewis: Thank you, let me know what I can do to move those two conversations along, I do think it's important to open up partners table to organizations who are committed and have an interest. This phase is about relationships and planning, not construction, so let's do that work.

Stacia Hernandez: We've been working well with project staff to evaluate options. Moving forward, the next best thing to work on is getting agreements in place, and we're eager to work on those. The riverside approach we proposed is what was always contemplated, it's a true riverwalk, so we are having those conversations to see how we can reconfigure things or even reevaluate the phasing, and we appreciate the opportunity. We have no

concerns with Phase 1, we know there was a small funding shortfall to begin with, and whatever we can do to help get over the line, we're willing to do that.

Commissioner O'Donnell: My internet broke up and I didn't hear what Stacia said.

Brian Moore: This meeting is recorded if you want a recap afterwards, but Stacia could you recap what you said?

Stacia Hernandez: Sure, we have been working well with the team and we are eager to get those agreements in place. As a tribal government, we have a unique status and not only that but we are the residents of the falls. We want to work to address funding shortages. Regarding the riverside approach, I said that it was always contemplated, we are just proposing that we do that sooner rather than later, as a permanent access route in order to keep folks safe.

Brian Moore: Stacia, when you talk about the riverside approach, do you mean revising the masterplan and making that the permanent approach?

Stacia Hernandez: I think it's open and we would have to address those cost estimates, but yes then we'd have those conversations with everyone. Building a permanent improvement and a permanent access route.

Commissioner Savas: I'm hearing three things from this morning, financial resources required, getting agreements in place, and changes to the masterplan,

Brian Moore: I'd add to that possible changes at the partners table.

Commissioner Savas: Sequencing those, what's the next step?

Brian Moore: I think agreements are the next step, without those, advancing the phase one idea or shuffling partners table would be challenging to do. We need clarity in how we want to approach things and work together, in order to discuss changes to the partners table and master plan. Then we would identify the phase one construction project. Phase one identification is kind of the last thing if you have a linear sequence. We could find ways to move forward in parallel, and accelerate towards construction while doing that other work.

Commissioner Savas: Would Metro take the lead on that?

Brian Moore: Yes. I think the initial agreement that needs to be addressed is the easement, because it really frames the relationship between the legacy project property interest in the site and the property owner. That's the key document that needs to be updated, in addition to a development agreement. Recommend that partners from government entities consider a formal government to government relationship with CTGR.

Commissioner Savas: What the pathway is for those four things, what's the most challenging? I imagine it's the money. To take steps, need to identify how we all feel we

should fill that funding gap. If any one of the four have roadblocks, everything else is futile to a degree.

Brian Moore: Yes, and another way of looking at it, is that without those agreements, we may only have a phase one, and working out those agreements can help reach our shared goals.

Councilor Lewis: I have a question. My understanding is that the Oregon City work to review programming is still underway, are there any updates there?

Tony Konkol: We are currently taking to the city commission the operating agreement with the WFT. Staff have been working with them on programming, I think details need to be worked out as to how that relationship will look.

Representative Meek: I think we need work together to find a more expedient path to agreements to avoid risking loss of income. Let me know how I can help this work move forward.

Roundtable updates:

Tony Konkol: No updates, except taking programming agreement to commission soon.

Councilor Lewis: No updates.

Councilwoman Denise Harvey: Having technical difficulties, Stacia shared update: We recently entered agreement with GBD architects to kick off our masterplanning, we are working with DEQ to do testing, and doing work on the UST's and parking lot and on site including overarching work plan.

Councilwoman Denise Harvey: Thank you for your time and consideration, I look forward to future planning and working together.

Commissioner O'Donnell: Simply thanks for invitation. Today's conversation is the start of a more detailed conversation, partners should sit down and think about what is their priorities, what's negotiable and not, let's identify hurdles and clear them together.

Commissioner Juan Carlos Gonzales: I appreciate working with Councilor Lewis and CTGR, and I love this project. We have met many times as a council to discuss flexibility to move this forward. We have only gotten more invested since I started. Appreciate opportunity to work with you all on this.

Marissa Madrigal: No updates, I just want to express gratitude to partners staff and CTGR to identify next steps. As a suggestion, making a timeline of next steps would be good, having some boundaries on that to make sure we move forward, especially with pressure that the state is under.

Brian Moore: I think things have just started to come together around agreements, I think we'll have a substantial update at the next partners meeting.

Commissioner Martha Schrader: I'm committed to this project, hope these agreements come together quickly.

Mayor Dan Holladay: No updates.

MG Devereux: Thanks to the partners for continued work, the road has had bumps but has been very rewarding part of my participation. Looking forward to next steps and challenges..

Commissioner Savas: Thanks everyone, I appreciate everyone's contributions. Regarding timeline, maybe we need to figure out what speed we're comfortable moving at, as far as the partners are concerned. How we approach timeline. Be mindful of one another's organizational structure. Coupled with the public who is invested and excited. Many eyes are on this project and we have to be mindful of expectations. A future topic would be what pace are we comfortable moving at.

Raihana: No updates for this project. Tangentially, as Representative Meek said, there is a special session that begins today, a number of bills about police accountability and COVID response, as well as a second special session in July to discuss the state budget, that may have implications for this project. Grateful for partners and CTGR and this project's role in the region's economic recovery

Next steps and closing business:

Working on our agreements, beginning negotiations in July. My expectation is that we'll have a significant update regarding the project schedule or substantial progress on agreements by next partners meeting.

Please stay tuned through your staff attending our TAC meetings, and we look forward to seeing you again in a few months.

Meeting adjourned 10:06 AM