

C4g
pdc 45
220
6521



BILL SANDERSON

The Right Ingredients

**A
N
I
P

R
E
P
O
R
T**

September 4, 1962

TO: Albina Neighborhood Improvement Committee

FROM: Portland Development Commission
John B. Kenward, Executive Director

SUBJECT: Review of Survey and Planning Stage Activities
For the Albina Neighborhood Improvement Project

C45
pdc

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- I. Purpose of Report
- II. Historical Sketch
- III. Project Area Map
- IV. Report on Planning Stage
 - A. Citizens Activities
 - B. Surveys
 - C. Planning Analysis
(see blue page)
- V. Improvement Costs
- VI. Action Requested

PORTLAND CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
LIBRARY COPY
DATE RECEIVED 11-14-62

I. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- a. The purpose of this report is to summarize the results of the survey and planning work by the staffs of the Portland Development Commission and the City Planning Commission. Through preliminary review by the Development Commission, the Planning Commission, and the Albina Neighborhood Improvement Committee, it is anticipated that procedural and policy questions may be resolved so that the official report "Part I, Application for Loan and Grant" may be submitted to the members of the Portland Development Commission for approval and submission to the Federal Government.
- b. Following review by the regional office of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the Albina Neighborhood Improvement Plan will be open for discussion at a Public Hearing and then must receive approval of the Development Commission, Planning Commission and City Council.
- c. Following these official approvals, the final documented report "Part II, Application for Loan and Grant" will be submitted to the Federal Government for approval by Mr. Slayton, Commissioner of the Urban Renewal Administration in Washington, D. C.
- d. To summarize, the purpose of this report is to provide available information for review by the following groups:

| | | |
|---|-------------|--------|
| Urban Renewal Committee, City Planning Commission | September 4 | (A.M.) |
| Portland Development Commission | September 4 | (P.M.) |
| Albina Neighborhood Improvement Committee | September 6 | |

II. HISTORICAL SKETCH

1960

The idea for an improvement program began to take shape as a result of a one-day "Community Conference on The Problems, Needs and Resources of The Albina District" sponsored by The Urban League on January 30, 1960, at the Vancouver Avenue First Baptist Church. John Kenward, Executive Director of the Portland Development Commission and Charles Woodward, Past Director of the City Planning Commission, participated in a panel to discuss prospects for future development of the neighborhood.

Aug. 1960

Following the workshop, the Albina Neighborhood Council became interested in getting an improvement program started. In August 1960, members of the Albina Neighborhood Council met with members of the Portland Development Commission. The Development Commission agreed to provide technical assistance to a citizens' committee in the Albina Neighborhood to explore the possibility of gaining funds from the Federal Government for an urban renewal conservation and rehabilitation program.

Oct. 1960

The Council appointed Reverend Cortlandt Cambric as Chairman of a neighborhood improvement committee. He contacted various neighborhood organizations and property owners and in October, 1960, the eighteen-member Albina Neighborhood Improvement Committee (ANIC) began holding meetings and gathering information about their neighborhood.

Nov. 1960

On November 2, 1960, ANIC sponsored a general neighborhood meeting at the Vancouver Avenue First Baptist Church. The purpose of the meeting was to present the idea of a coordinated improvement project to the residents of the neighborhood and to find whether they were interested and what problems they felt were most critical. As a result of the interest shown at this meeting, ANIC encouraged the Development Commission to discuss the possibility of an urban renewal conservation project with officials of the Federal Government.

Dec. 1960

In December, 1960, officials of the Housing and Home Finance Agency from Washington, D. C. and San Francisco visited Portland, met with city officials and neighborhood leaders and reviewed the conditions. They felt that a successful program could be developed in the Albina Neighborhood.

Jan. 1961

In January, 1961, the Committee members reviewed a proposal for a specific project area located between Fremont, Skidmore, Vancouver, and the alley between Albina and Mississippi Avenues. After a discussion of this area, they decided to gather additional information by talking to residents and asking the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) whether they would back home improvement loans if this area were to be selected as the first project area.

Feb. 1961

On February 7, 1961, ANIC organized a detailed inspection of five structures by members of the local FHA Staff. As a result of this survey, Mr. Oscar Pederson, Director of the local FHA office, reported that this area would qualify for FHA home improvement loans if it were to become an urban renewal project.

July 1961

As a result of the foregoing activities, the Development Commission staff began preparing an application for survey and planning funds which was reviewed by ANIC members on July 20, 1961. On July 26, the application was reviewed and approved by the Portland Development Commission and the City Planning Commission. As a result of favorable recommendation of these three bodies, the City Council approved the Survey and Planning Application for the Albina Neighborhood Improvement Project on August 3, 1961. The report was transmitted to the Federal Government and approval was granted by the Housing and Home Finance Agency on October 12.

Oct. 1961

After receiving approval of the planning budget, the Development Commission leased and prepared the house at 3726 N. Kerby Avenue for use as the Albina Neighborhood Improvement Information Center (ANIIC). The Center has provided the neighborhood residents an opportunity for daily contact with survey and planning personnel and has provided space for many citizen meetings and activities.

Citizen
Action

During the first year of activity, the Albina Neighborhood Improvement Committee worked to help solve some of the individual problems mentioned during the general meeting in November, 1960. Because of the need for better street lighting, ANIC discussed the problems with the City Street Light Engineer and thereafter sponsored petitions for additional lights in the area bounded by Fremont, Russell, Williams and Union Avenues. With the cooperation and assistance of Commissioner Ormond Bean and the City Street Light Bureau, a plan was developed and 35 new lights were installed by Portland General Electric Company. ANIC then organized a work party to trim tree limbs which obstructed some of the lights. Through such organized effort, the Committee is continuing to work to solve other neighborhood problems.

Block
Groups

Another example of the effectiveness of cooperative citizen action was the organization of Mrs. Joseph Crane's Block Group. The residents of the block bounded by Vancouver, Gantenbein, Failing and Beech Streets began holding block meetings to combat a rodent problem. After Mrs. Crane explained the interest of her Block Group at an ANIC meeting, the Committee contacted the Bureau of Health and gained the help of Mr. Jack Alderton, Sanitary Inspector. Because the Block Group found that it was just as important to remove rodent harborages as it was to kill the rodents, they organized a clean-up campaign. ANIC was able to get a truck donated, and the members of the Block Group cleaned out basements, garages and back yards and loaded the truck and swept the alley on September 23, 1961.

Following the clean-up campaign, Mr. Alderton worked with the members of the Block Group to kill the rodents. Mrs. Bowles' Block Group has more recently held a successful clean-up campaign also.

General
Neighborhood
Meeting

Following a year of activity under the fine leadership of Reverend Cambric, ANIC established bylaws and elected Reverend T. X. Graham and Father Mell Stead as Co-Chairmen. To review the progress of the program for residents of the neighborhood, ANIC sponsored the second general neighborhood meeting at Boise School on December 18, 1961. Mayor Schrunk, Commissioner Bean, members of the Development Commission and numerous city and federal officials attended and offered encouragement and support to the Committee and the neighborhood audience.

ALBINA NEIGHBORHOOD IMPROVEMENT PROJECT



IV. REPORT ON PLANNING STAGE

A. CITIZEN ACTIVITIES

The past interest and support of the people who have participated in the development and planning of an improvement project in Albina Neighborhood has been the most important element of the program. It has been illustrated that joint effort by individual neighbors and cooperation by various community agencies can solve many of the more obvious problems such as littered yards, rodent control and street lighting.

Since the Information Center was established and began operation on November 1, 1961, many meetings have been held and activities accomplished:

Albina Neighborhood Improvement Committee

| | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| Regular Monthly Meetings | 7 |
| Special Meetings | 1 |
| General Neighborhood Meeting | 1 |
| Coffee Sessions for Visiting Guests | 2 |

Subcommittee Meetings

| | |
|---|---|
| Planning Subcommittee | 8 |
| Street Light Subcommittee (Petitions were circulated and 320 signatures obtained from 396 structures facing north- south streets in project area) | 1 |
| Tree Program Subcommittee | 3 |

Block Group Activity

- 33 Meetings (including 4 meetings of people in proposed park site)
- 5 Block Chairmen elected representing 7 blocks
(Average Block Group attendance at Block Meetings has been 40%)
- 1 Block Clean-up Campaign (Block 13)

Information Center

| | |
|---|------|
| Number of Mailings | 64 |
| Number of Pieces (including notices, agendas and minutes of ANIC and Block Group meetings, monthly news-bulletins and special mailings) | 7400 |

B. SURVEYS

All surveys were undertaken to gather information required by the Federal Government to determine whether the project area is eligible to receive local and Federal government money for carrying out the proposals in the improvement plan.

The outstanding cooperation received from the property owners and tenants in the project area is a credit to their individual interest in the program as well as the activities and accomplishments of the Albina Neighborhood Improvement Committee during the past two years.

Explanation of all surveys was given at ANIC meetings prior to the start of the survey. Further information was available through many Block Group meetings or by a visit or telephone call to the Information Center staff. No survey or interview was made without first contacting the property owner or tenant to gain his permission and to set a convenient appointment.

Field work:

| | | <u>Structures</u> | <u>Surveyed</u> | <u>Cooperation</u> |
|-------------------|--|-------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------|
| Nov. 4 - Dec. 9 | Exterior Structure Survey (By City Building Bureau personnel under contract with Development Commission.) | 522 | 512 | 98% |
| Jan. 13 - Mar. 15 | Interior Structure Survey (242 of 292 Dwelling Units) | 253 | 201 | 79% |
| Jan. 9 - Mar. 15 | Financial Capability and Relocation Needs Survey (a. 260 of 292 Dwelling Units b. 13 additional surveys were conducted during Rehabilitation Feasibility Survey) | 253 | 214 | 85% |
| Mar. 23 - Jun. 1 | Acquisition Appraisal of Park Site Properties (By Laidlaw and Trowbridge) | 32 | 32 (plus one vacant parcel) | 100% |
| Jun. 20 - Aug. 19 | Rehabilitation Feasibility Study (Appraisals by: Walstrom, Cost Estimates by: Curtis of Hoffard, Inc.) | 62 | 45 | 73% |











C. Planning Analysis
(by City Planning Commission
Lloyd T. Keefe, Director)

1. Housing
2. Business Development
3. Project Zoning
4. Traffic Circulation
5. Project Park
6. School Service
7. Streets, Curbs, Sidewalks and Alleys
8. Project Utilities
9. Street Lighting
10. Street Trees
11. Project Maps

Note: This section of the report has been prepared by Rodney O'Hiser (Senior Planner) to summarize the work of the Planning Commission staff with the Planning Subcommittee of the Albina Neighborhood Improvement Committee and the Information Center staff of the Portland Development Commission.

C. PLANNING ANALYSIS

Prior to filing for a survey and planning grant, the Albina Neighborhood Improvement Committee interviewed 335 project area families to identify problems existent in the project area. The problems listed were as follows: traffic hazards; inadequate street lighting; insufficient street sweeping; inadequate tree and shrub trimming; need for rodent control; cleaning of vacant lots and alleys; and need for a park area.

Upon approval of the survey and planning funds by HHFA, the City Planning Commission was retained to review the deficiencies which had been noted by the project area residents, to identify any additional problems which were prevalent in the area, and to prepare a detailed comprehensive plan and program designed to enhance the residential environment of the project area. A five-member planning subcommittee of ANIC was appointed to review and offer suggestions on the surveys, analyses and planning proposals under consideration by the Planning Commission; also, this committee regularly reported its findings to the full committee.

Following is a resume of the planning proposals prepared by the Planning Commission and recommended for inclusion as part of the Urban Renewal Plan and program for the Albina project area.

1. Housing

Housing development at a density of 2500 square feet per unit is the predominant land use recommended in the improvement plan for the project area (Project Proposals Figure 7).

The project today is mainly residential in character, containing 696 dwelling units mostly in one and two family structures, with the remainder in low density apartment development (Existing Land Use, Figure 2). It is estimated that when the project area is developed to capacity -- including legal conversion of one family to two family dwellings and the construction of new units on vacant land -- the area will number approximately 815 dwelling units.*

The basis for this housing use proposal, which represents a re-affirmation of the desirability of the existing pattern of residential development in the area, is Portland's long standing planning and zoning policy to maintain and support residential neighborhoods in close proximity to the central commercial area, thus affording people convenient access to major employment, shopping and recreation facilities.

The City's Comprehensive Development Plan and the Planning and Zoning Code** both substantiate this policy of preserving central area residential neighborhoods. The Comprehensive Development Plan designates the Boise School neighborhood, of which the project area is a part, as a residential district. Most of the project area is assigned a residential zoning classification (Project Zoning Figure 6) which has

been the case since original adoption of a zoning ordinance by the City in 1924.

The project area is in relatively close proximity to outstanding regional shopping and recreational facilities, including the Central Business District (2½ miles); the Lloyd Center (2 miles), a regional shopping center which contains ~~and adjoins~~ office buildings; and the Memorial Coliseum (1 mile), a metropolitan exposition and recreation facility. Also, the nearness to numerous community facilities (Community Facilities Figure 5), constitutes additional desirable attributes for residential development in the project area.

An essential element of an improvement program for the project area is the elimination of the major and minor housing deficiencies (Structural Condition Figure 3) which now exist. A successful endeavor to upgrade existing housing and encourage new residential construction, combined with the improvement and development of existing and needed local facilities described below, will be of lasting benefit to the residents of the project area, and should serve to stimulate other similar programs throughout the city.

* Planning Commission dwelling unit analysis prepared for Land for Schools report, 1958

** Portland Comprehensive Development Plan adopted by the City Planning Commission, June 1958

Portland Planning and Zoning Code adopted by City Council, July 1959

2. Business Development

In addition to residential and park development, a recommendation for a small amount of business development at the extremities of the project is encompassed in the project proposals (Figure 7). This includes (1) a new bowling alley development within the existing business development along N. Mississippi Avenue and (2) commercial development along N. Vancouver Avenue near the intersection of N. Fremont Street. The proposed bowling alley development was reviewed by the Albina Neighborhood Improvement Committee. (Their recommendation that the impact on adjacent residential development be minimized was implemented by the provision of an M3 buffer zone designation on the bowling alley property, adjacent to residential development.) The Vancouver-Fremont development, located at the intersection of two major traffic arterials, does not have an adverse impact on neighboring housing, but rather offers a possibility for development of commercial facilities convenient to the project area.

3. Project Zoning

The zoning recommended for the project (Figure 6) corresponds to the land uses proposed for the project area.

The A2.5 apartment residential presently designated for most of the project area is retained. In order to provide adequate protection to the project area, the following two changes in the existing pattern are recommended:

- a. Change the spot A1 apartment zone (1000 square feet per dwelling unit) located at the southwest corner of the intersection of N. Beech Street and N. Haight Avenue to an A2.5 apartment zone.

This proposal is made to maintain a consistent pattern of zoning throughout the project.

- b. Change the zone classification for the area located 100 feet north of N. Shaver Street, 100 feet north of N. Fremont Street, the center line of the alley, or 108 feet west of N. Vancouver and the center line of the alley east of N. Vancouver from the existing C2 commercial zone district to an A2.5 (2500 sq. ft. per dwelling unit) Apartment Residential District.

The character of present development along N. Vancouver Avenue is predominantly residential. Vancouver Avenue, a project area boundary street, is a secondary traffic arterial serving as both a neighborhood collector and a through street. Its efficiency could be retarded by strip commercial development. Also, the project area could be adversely affected by bordering on a narrow fringe development which would attract truck and vehicle traffic extraneous to the residential area. Therefore, residential zoning on Vancouver Avenue is deemed more appropriate than commercial.

Property owners in the blocks included in the proposed Vancouver Avenue zone change originally requested a consideration for such action, and have indicated support for this proposal.

4. Traffic Circulation

The project proposals plan (Figure 7) calls for the construction of four landscaped traffic diverters for the purpose of directing through traffic either emanating from, or extraneous to, the project area on to the

traffic collector streets at the periphery of the project in order to insure a quiet, safe, livable residential district.

Such traffic control should reduce auto accidents now prevalent in the area. As indicated in the above mentioned opinion survey, residents of the project are concerned about the lack of traffic safety that the present gridiron street system affords; accordingly, the Albina Neighborhood Improvement Committee has endorsed the concept of developing means for achieving a safer residential area.

Five alternate schemes for diverting through traffic were studied by the representatives of various city and local bureau and agencies concerned with street development, including the Portland Development Commission, Bureau of Traffic Engineering, Bureau of Fire, Office of City Engineer, Mass Transit and Public Works Coordinator, local FHA planning personnel, and the City Planning Commission. Of the various feasible alternates considered, the interior street system indicated in the proposed plan was selected as the most favorable.

The project area is bounded on all sides by secondary traffic thoroughfares. The Bureau of Public Works has prepared a tentative plan, for study only, for widening the north boundary street, N. Skidmore Street and N. Vancouver Avenue at the east extremity of the project in order to effect a system of major streets integrated with the interstate freeway, ramps, and bridges soon to be constructed in the vicinity of the project.

A comprehensive transportation plan for the Portland Metropolitan area is being prepared cooperatively by (city, county, metropolitan, and state) traffic, transit and urban planning personnel. This plan will be helpful in determining the need and location of major street improvements in the community.

As the proposed modification of the interior street system of the project area, described above, will reroute traffic now using the project streets as through routes, on to the collector streets at the periphery of the project, widening of the peripheral streets should be considered if future assigned design volumes being determined during the course of the preparation of the transportation plan indicates the need for greater arterial street capacity.

5. Project Park

A 4.5 acre park is recommended for development within the project area. The basis for this proposal is the City Park Bureau standard that residents of a housing area should have access to a neighborhood park facility within one-quarter of a mile of their home.

As pointed out in the opinion survey on project area problems, the residents of the project area lack convenient access to a neighborhood park facility. The neighboring Peninsula, Overlook, Irving, and Lillis-Albina parks are all considerably removed from the project area; also, several major traffic arterials isolate the project residents from these facilities (Community Facilities, Figure 5). The Boise School, which is contiguous to, and serves the project, lacks adequate playground space.

The lack of adequate recreation space for adults, as well as children, constitutes an environmental deficiency. Therefore, the development of a park facility, including facilities for small children, an active area for larger children, and a quiet area for adults, is an essential element of an improvement plan and program for the project area.

The recommendation for the precise location of the site was made jointly by the Albina Neighborhood Improvement Committee's Planning Subcommittee and representatives of the various city agencies having an interest in such a development. These agencies were the Bureau of Parks, Portland Development Commission, Bureau of Traffic Engineering, Mass Transit Coordinator's Office, and City Engineer's Office. This group reviewed all possible considerations relating to the impact that a park development would have on the neighborhood and community. This analysis included: the allowable minimum size of a park; the costs of acquiring various alternate sites (five were studied); the number of housing deficiencies within alternate sites; the impact of the various alternate sites on internal and external traffic circulation, mass transit routes, and on overhead and underground utilities. Convenient and safe access to all users of the park and suitability for possible expansion to a full neighborhood park was also part of the analysis.

The recommended minimum size for a neighborhood park in the Portland area is ten acres. This standard was recently formulated by the Portland Metropolitan Planning Commission in cooperation with local city planning and park officials. The project area dwelling unit count, when fully developed, is estimated to be 815, or approximately 40% of the Boise School neighborhood, expected to number 2,060 dwelling units. The recommended 4.5 acre project park, which includes two project blocks and the proposed vacation of 400 feet of N. Commercial Avenue and two alleys, represents a facility in scale with the area and the number of residents to be served; also the proposed park is of sufficient size to contain the minimum amount of facilities to serve all age groups in the project area.

The park site, which has been selected, affords convenient and safe access to the project residents, does lend itself to possible expansion to a full neighborhood school-park* facility if such development were to be deemed necessary at a later date, and does not present any problems for traffic and bus circulation and existing and future utility improvements.

* See Public School Service below

6. School Service

The project area is served by the Humboldt Primary School (kindergarten through 4th grade), the Boise Elementary School (kindergarten through 8th grade), and the Jefferson High School. The Humboldt School provides kindergarten through 4th grade school service for the portion of the project area north of N. Failing Street, and the Boise School affords kindergarten through 4th grade school service for the remainder of the project and full elementary school service for the entire project.

The Humboldt School, constructed in 1959, was a development recommended in the Planning Commission's comprehensive school report LAND FOR SCHOOLS. It was proposed in this report that a full elementary school site and facility be developed to eliminate the school and site deficiencies of neighboring schools. This report did not proffer a specific recommendation for the Boise School, pending a possible urban renewal study which would include a detailed analysis as to site and building sufficiency.

The School District does plan, when funds are available, to expand the Humboldt primary site and facility into a full elementary school, according to the Planning Commission recommendation. The present primary school is overcrowded and two classrooms are now being constructed which will alleviate this condition.

The 33-classroom Boise School, though 36 years old, is a well maintained facility. However, the 3.69 acre school site is presently inadequate. The density ratio standard adopted by the Planning Commission and the School District for a two-story elementary school is 4.0 classrooms per acre; the Boise School measures 8.9, indicating a serious deficiency of space for playground activities and the parking of staff automobiles.

An analysis of enrollment at saturation, when the school's service area is fully developed and attendance boundaries are revised to effect safe transit to school, indicates that the Boise facility could be reduced to a 20-classroom facility which would require a five acre site to meet local standards. Therefore, the site should still be increased by at least 1.3 acres to afford optimum space for school recreation.

The location of the Boise School (Figure 5), contiguous to the impending freeway complex, calls for consideration of this school's relocation. A location in the center of the project, adjacent to a neighborhood park would be most appropriate; however, owing to the good quality of the present structure, relocation would not be feasible until the building becomes structurally or functionally obsolete. It is assumed that the present plant will continue in service for 15 or 20 years.

The School District has acquired a parcel of land including a vacated street, measuring 0.35 acres adjacent to the school for off-street parking space for the staff. The Planning Commission also urges that additional adjacent land be acquired when funds are available to alleviate the playground deficiency.

7. Streets, Curbs, Sidewalks and Alleys

The City Engineer's office has conducted a comprehensive survey of the adequacy of the streets, curbs, sidewalks and alleys in the project.

These facilities were checked against established city standards. A number of deficiencies were noted, including inadequate street surface and sub-surface, high street crowns, high curbs, broken curbs, damaged sidewalks, and unimproved alleys.

The recommended improvement plan for the project area includes the elimination of these deficiencies by new construction, repairs and the paving of those alleys which are not now improved.

8. Project Utilities

Water

Water service to all housing units in the project area is adequate to serve present and future requirements. The Water Bureau recently completed a construction program to improve water distribution facilities in North Portland. A new water tank recently developed, as part of this program, has upgraded the service to the project area and adequate pressure is now available at all times.

Sewer

The City Engineer's office has analyzed the sewer service now provided in the project and has rendered the opinion that these project facilities are adequate to service present and future requirements.

Power

The two utility companies which serve the project area, Portland General Electric and Pacific Power and Light, have been consulted to determine the adequacy of present service and any future plans for development in the project area. Present service is adequate. The Pacific Power and Light Company plans to reroute main distribution lines, presently located in the project, owing to disruption of the present system by the Interstate Freeway development. It is recommended that, when possible, main distribution lines be relocated along major traffic thoroughfares at the project area's periphery rather than on residential streets within the project.

9. Street Lighting

The street lighting in the project area has, in the past, been inadequate. The voters of Portland have made funds available for the installation and conversion of luminaires in districts where residents indicated a desire to upgrade neighborhood street lighting. The Albina Neighborhood Improvement Committee has sponsored a petition drive to acquire signatures for better street lighting in the project area. Through their efforts, a new street lighting program is soon to be completed which includes 30 new luminaires and 31 conversions.

10. Street Trees

The project area contains tree stumps and street trees, most of which are oversized and cause curb and sidewalk breakage. A program to repair the curbs and sidewalks will include the removal of stumps and oversized trees. The utility companies serving the area are interested in a tree removal and planting program which will be compatible with the power lines. A joint committee of residents of the project area and the power companies, and other civic groups, has been formed to carry out such a program. The utility companies are also undertaking a program of modernizing their integrated wiring system.



PROJECT PROPOSALS

FIGURE 7
 OREGON R-8
 MARCH 1962

ALBINA NEIGHBORHOOD IMPROVEMENT PROJECT PORTLAND, OREGON

PORTLAND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
 CITY OF PORTLAND
 MULTNOMAH COUNTY, OREGON
 PREPARED BY
 PORTLAND CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

LEGEND

| LAND USE | | STREETS AND ALLEYS | |
|---|-----------------------|---|---------------------------------|
|  | APARTMENT RESIDENTIAL |  | SHAPING AND RESURFACING |
|  | COMMERCIAL |  | NO IMPROVEMENT REQUIRED |
|  | LIGHT MANUFACTURING |  | SEWER, WATER, AND GAS EASEMENTS |
|  | PROJECT PARK | | |

V. IMPROVEMENT COSTS

The costs of carrying out the improvement project include:

1. Home improvements to be made by property owners;
2. Physical improvements to be installed in project area; and
3. Administrative costs of planning, rehabilitation, counseling to property owners, acquisition of structures where rehabilitation is not feasible, assistance to families who need to move, and technical assistance to the Albina Neighborhood Improvement Committee and Block Groups.

A proposal to finance some project improvements by assessment to property owners was part of the Survey and Planning Application which was reviewed and approved by the Albina Neighborhood Improvement Committee in July 1961. The advantage of this proposal to property owners in the area is that the Federal Government will grant \$2.00 for every \$1.00 spent for such improvements to help pay for other improvements such as the park. Although the final project budget is not completed, the costs of improvements identified by the Planning Commission are listed for further consideration:

Proposed improvements within the Albina Neighborhood Improvement Project:

| | |
|---------------------|----------------|
| Traffic Diverters | \$ 9,866 |
| Street Paving | 96,308 |
| Curbs and Sidewalks | 39,985 |
| Alley Paving | 90,403 |
| Park Development | <u>346,478</u> |
| Improvement Cost | \$ 586,984 |

Proposed cost to property owners:

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------|
| Street Paving | \$ 96,308 |
| Curbs and Sidewalks | 39,985 |
| Alley Paving | <u>90,403</u> |
| Property Owner's Improvement Cost | \$ 226,696 |

Other improvements which can be made as a result of Federal participation:

| | |
|--------------------------|----------------|
| Traffic Diverters | \$ 9,866 |
| Park Development | <u>346,478</u> |
| Project Improvement Cost | \$ 356,344 |

The purpose of the surveys carried out in the planning stage has been to see how much home improvements may cost and to determine whether it would be fair to ask property owners to pay some of the cost of the proposed improvements.

The following preliminary analysis has been made:

A. Condition of Physical structures:

| | | |
|---------------------|-----------|-----------|
| Minor or No Repairs | 282 | 54% |
| Needing Repairs | 214 | 41% |
| Possible Demolition | <u>27</u> | <u>5%</u> |
| Total | 523 | 100% |

B. Value of Property:

From the Multnomah County Tax Assessor's office, we know the value of single or two-family structures ranges from \$1375 to \$14,200: The average is about \$6300.

C. Cost of Home Improvements:

Minor or No Repairs

As part of the Rehabilitation Feasibility Appraisal, 14 structures were selected from this category to provide examples of costs and values of the majority of the structures in the area. Frank Curtis estimated needed improvements on these structures to range from \$0 to \$1,765, with a median of \$620. His report also suggested that a 20% increment be added in cases where the work is contracted with private firms rather than being done by the home owner. Ralph Walstrom listed all of these structures as feasible for rehabilitation: Seven gained value similar to the cost of improvement, five gained less value than the cost of improvement and two gained more value than the cost of improvement.

Needing Repairs

Following the Rehabilitation Feasibility Study, the staff prepared a guide sheet listing typical improvements and typical costs for each improvement. Mildred Easley has evaluated 179 structures in this category and found that cost of repairs range from \$161 to \$5,300, with an average of \$1,175 and a median of \$1,090.

Possible Demolition

The structure surveys indicated 59 homes which property owners might be unable to increase the property value an amount equal to the cost of improvements. As a result of the Rehabilitation Feasibility Appraisal it is estimated that it would not be feasible for property owners to rehabilitate 30 structures which are in very poor condition in the project area. Each such property owner would have an option to do the following:

1. Make necessary improvements regardless of feasibility study.
2. Clear the lot and build a new structure.
3. Sell to the Development Commission, who would clear the dilapidated house and sell the cleared land to a person desiring to build a new home or apartments.

D. Ability to Pay:

Home Improvements

Although the evaluation is not completed, Mildred Easley has compared income and present monthly house payments of families in the Needing Repair category of structures. The income range was from \$66 to \$800 per month with an average of \$330 and a median of \$325. For 179 property owners who would have the greatest investment, it appears that 60% are likely able to afford improvements, 28% are likely to have difficulty qualifying for financing. There is an additional 12% of the cases where more information is needed to make evaluation.

Because this evaluation is made for properties which need the most improvement, it is reasonable to assume that a much higher percent than 60% will be able to afford the improvements throughout the project area.

Other Improvements

To have some idea of the cost of improvements to each property owner if an assessment district were established to pay for alley paving, street resurfacing, and curb and sidewalk repairs, Tom Notos has computed the cost according to the following possible plan:

1. Blocks which have cement alleys would not be charged for alley paving (Blocks 11, 14, 23, 25 and M-24)
2. Property owners facing Vancouver, Skidmore and Fremont would not be charged for street paving.
3. Property owners of corner lots would be charged for the lesser of their two frontages.
4. All other improvements would be charged equally to property owners on the basis of a front foot cost.

This plan would cost most property owners \$11.02 per front foot. (For a standard 50x100 lot this would be \$551.00). Such costs could be put under a Bancroft bond and paid over a 10 year period at 6% interest. This would mean a monthly payment of \$6.11 per month for a 50x100 foot lot.

It does not appear that such a cost would reduce the ability of property owners to pay for home improvements except in a small percentage hardship cases. With special effort on the part of the Albina Neighborhood Improvement Committee and the Information Center staff, it is felt that improvement can be worked out for these cases also.

ACTION REQUESTED FROM GROUPS REVIEWING REPORT

September 4 Urban Renewal Committee, City Planning Commission

Review of survey results and other preliminary staff proposals

Review of contract responsibilities

Approval of Planning Analysis (Item C, this report)

September 4 Portland Development Commission

Review of survey results and preliminary staff proposals

September 6 Albina Neighborhood Improvement Committee

Review of survey results and consideration and/or approval of project proposals

VII. PARTICIPANTS IN PROJECT PLANNING

1. Official Groups

CITY COUNCIL

Terry D. Schrunk, Mayor

William A. Bowes
Ormond R. Bean

Stanley W. Earl
Mark A. Grayson

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

J. H. Sroufe, President

Herbert M. Clark, Jr.
Gordon C. Dudley
Neil R. Kochendoerfer
Charles McKinley

Lewis G. Prichard
Glenn Stanton
Loren H. Thompson
L. V. Windnagle

PORTLAND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

Ira C. Keller, Chairman

A. V. Fonder
Vincent Raschio

Russell M. Colwell
Harold Halvorsen

2. Citizen Groups

ALBINA NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL

1960-61, 1961-62

Mrs. Evelyn Harriman, Chairman
Mr. Joseph Kling, Vice-Chairman
Mrs. Norma Dee Graham, Secretary

1962-63

Rev. O. H. Lakey, Chairman
Mrs. Joseph C. Crane, Vice-Chairman
Mrs. Norma Dee Graham, Secretary

The 1961-62 membership roll of the Council lists 45 representatives of a variety of service organizations such as Churches, Schools, PTA Groups, City Agencies and many other neighborhood and community organizations who work and participate in the activities of Albina Neighborhood, and who, individually and as a group, have given a great deal of encouragement and assistance to the improvement program.

ALBINA NEIGHBORHOOD IMPROVEMENT COMMITTEE (ANIC)

Rev. T. X. Graham and Father Mell Stead, Co-Chairmen

Mrs. R. M. Beson
Mrs. Mamie Bowles
Mrs. S. Q. Broadous
Mr. Frank Brown
Mrs. Joseph C. Crane
Mrs. Irene Cranford
Mr. James Crolley
Mr. Herbert Hale

Mrs. Evelyn Harriman
Mr. John Holley
Mr. Joseph LaBate
Mrs. John E. Louis
Mr. Lloyd Rainwater
Rev. Roosevelt Rogers
Mrs. C. W. Sanders
Mr. Willie Whitley

Other members who participated in early activities:

Rev. Cortlandt Cambric, Past Chairman
Mr. Arthur Cox
Mrs. Julia Ganter
Mrs. Caroline McDonald

Mrs. N. B. Parr
Mrs. Cleophas Smith
Rev. O. B. Williams

Planning Subcommittee

Mr. Frank Brown, Chairman
Mrs. Joseph C. Crane
Mr. John Holley
Mr. Victor Biersdorf
Mr. Herbert Lewis

Street Light Subcommittee

Mr. James Crolley
Mr. Herbert Lewis

Tree Program Subcommittee

Rev. F. J. Crear, Chairman
Mrs. Alice Kutch
Mr. E. H. Thiel
Mr. Herbert Lewis

Consultants to ANIC

Alex Pierce
Daryl May
L. H. Rosenthal
Thomas Bain
Jack Alderton
Jack Frost
Dorthea Lensch
Dale Christiansen
Robert Keilbach
Fred Hamilton
James Frazier

Architect (Beautification Association)
Land Architect (Beautification Association)
City Engineer
Sanitary Division: Health Bureau
Sanitary Division: Health Bureau
Metropolitan Youth Commission
Park Bureau
Park Bureau
State Employment Agency
Street Light Bureau
Urban League

3. Federal Government Agencies

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

Robert C. Weaver, Administrator
J. G. Melville, Administrator Region VI

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

Neal J. Hardy, Commissioner
Oscar Pederson, Director, Portland Office
Howard Heydlauff, Assistant Director

URBAN RENEWAL ADMINISTRATION

William L. Slayton, Commissioner
Robert E. McCabe, Director Region VI
Robert E. Boldt, Field Representative

4. Local Agency

PORTLAND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

Administrative and Technical

| | |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------|
| John B. Kenward, Executive Director | |
| Richard England | Cal Evans |
| John Douglas | Dorothy Lyon |
| Oliver Norville | Joy O'Brien |
| Dorothy Jones | James Robertson |
| Lois Pew | Theron Rust |
| Ruth Kriesel | Larry Roberts |
| Patricia Frank | Vince Gonzales |

Community Services Section (Information Center Staff)

Larry Coons, Community Services Coordinator
Tom Notos, Assistant Community Services Coordinator
Mildred Easley, Financial Consultant
Mary Raffety, Field Worker
Loretta Garner, Senior Stenographer
(Temporary: Harry Phillips, Max Paulin
and Marvis Manus)

CONSULTANTS

City Planning Commission

Administrative

Lloyd Keefe, Director
Penny Holmberg, Secretary

Albina Planning Section

| | |
|--------------------------------|--------------------|
| Rodney O'Hiser, Senior Planner | |
| Robert Lindh | Gordon Clark |
| Nancy Jensen | Paden Prichard |
| Dick Anderson | Judy Galantha |
| Robert Austin | Robert Wagenknecht |
| Charles Bentley | Gregory Baldwin |

Technical Advisors

Fire Bureau
Jack A. Jones, Battalion Chief

Park Bureau
Harry B. Buckley, Superintendent
Edward Erickson, Administrative Assistant

Public Works
Carl J. Wendt, Public Works Coordinator
William J. Weller, Traffic Engineer
L. H. Rosenthal, City Engineer
D. A. Dow, Assistant City Engineer

Water Bureau
H. Kenneth Anderson, Chief Engineer

School District
Dr. Amo DeBernardis, Assistant Superintendent
George M. Gwinn, Coordinator of Sites

Federal Housing Administration
John Carter, Chief Underwriter Portland Office
Warren Rice, Assistant Chief Underwriter Portland Office
Joseph Keyser, Architectural Examiner
Thomas Sheridan, Construction Cost Examiner

Building Bureau Personnel

| | |
|------------------------------|----------------|
| C. N. Christiansen, Director | |
| Clarence Crank | David Beckman |
| William Johnson | Ray McFarland |
| James McCoy | Frank Stiner |
| Jack Chegwiddden | Earl Norgard |
| Glen Fors | Childing Rosen |
| Jack Van Hoeter | Floyd Fuller |
| Pat Jennings | John Dunnigan |

William Laidlaw and Carl Trowbridge, Appraisers

Ralph Walstrom, Property Counselors, Inc.

Hoffard, Inc.

Leo Hoffard, Contractor
Frank Curtis, Cost Estimator
Robert Fujiwara (Park site model)