REPORT ON THE
GATEWAY REGIONAL CENTER URBAN RENEWAL PLAN

SECOND DRAFT

APRIL 2001

Prepared by:
The Portland Development Commission
1900 SW 4th Ave., Suite 7000
Portland, OR 97201

TABLE OF CONTENTS

REPORT ON THE GATEWAY REGIONAL CENTER URBAN RENEWAL PLAN

SECTION I. INTRODUCTION

The Portland Development Commission, as the City of Portland's urban renewal agency, has prepared the Gateway Regional Center Urban Renewal Plan in accordance with Chapter 457 of the Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS). ORS 457.085 (3) requires that an urban renewal report accompany the Plan.

The Report on the Gateway Regional Center Urban Renewal Plan provides technical information to support the Plan, and to assist the Portland Development Commission and the City Council in their deliberations on the Plan. The required elements of a Report on an Urban Renewal Plan are set forth in ORS 457.085 (3), subsections (a) through (i), stated below:

(a) A description of physical, social and economic conditions in the urban renewal areas of the plan and the expected impact, including the fiscal impact, of the plan in light of added services or increased population;
(b) Reasons for selection of each urban renewal area in the plan;
(c) The relationship between each project to be undertaken under the plan and the existing conditions in the urban renewal area;
(d) The estimated total cost of each project and the sources of moneys to pay such costs;
(e) The anticipated completion date for each project;
(f) The estimated amount of money required in each urban renewal area under ORS 457.420 to 457.460 and the anticipated year in which indebtedness will be retired or otherwise provided for under ORS 457.420 to 457.460;
(g) A financial analysis of the plan with sufficient information to determine feasibility;
(h) A fiscal impact statement that estimates the impact of the tax increment financing, both until and after the indebtedness is repaid, upon all entities levying taxes upon property in the urban renewal area; and
(i) A relocation report.

The balance of this Report addresses these requirements of ORS 457. In addition, this Report addresses compliance with the requirements of ORS 457.420 (2)(a), which sets limits on the amount of land area and assessed value within a jurisdiction that may be included within urban renewal areas.

Data for this Report has been compiled from several sources, including staff from the offices of Multnomah County Assessor, the Portland Bureau of Planning, the Portland Development Commission, the Portland Department of Transportation, other City bureaus and independent consultants participating in the Opportunity Gateway project. It also includes information derived from a market study prepared for the Commission by E.D. Hovee & Company, much of which is contained in the Opportunity Gateway Urban Renewal Feasibility Study (October 2000).

SECTION II. A DESCRIPTION OF PHYSICAL, SOCIAL, AND ECONOMIC CONDITIONS IN URBAN RENEWAL AREA

A. Physical Conditions

Land Area

The Gateway Regional Center Urban Renewal Area (or the "Area") contains 653 acres in east Portland. The Area includes portions of three neighborhoods (Hazelwood, Mill Park and Parkrose Heights). Its boundaries are roughly defined as NE Weidler Street to the north, I-205 to the west, SE Market Street to the south, and the zoning line separating low-density residential from other uses between 103rd Ave. and 114th Ave. to the east. Exhibit A of the Gateway Regional Center Urban Renewal Plan (or the "Plan") contains a legal description of the Area boundary.

1. Compliance with Land Area Requirements of ORS 457

ORS 457.420 (2)(a)(B) provides that the total land area of a proposed urban renewal area, when added to the land area of existing active urban renewal plans, may not exceed 15 percent of the City's total land area. The table below shows the acreage in existing urban renewal areas in Portland, and the acreage to be added in the proposed Area boundary.

District/Area	Acres
Acres in nine existing URAs	11,496
Acres in Gateway Regional Center URA	653
Total Acres, existing + proposed URAs	12,142
Total Acres, City of Portland	92,614
Percentage of Total Acres in URAs	13.11%

The table illustrates that the addition of the Gateway Regional Center Urban Renewal Area does not place the City of Portland above the 15 percent acreage limitation. With this Area, the City would retain the capacity to add approximately 1,750 acres in new or expanded urban renewal areas.

2. Land Uses and Zoning

The Gateway Regional Center Urban Renewal Area contains a mixture of commercial, industrial and residential land uses, as shown below:

Land Use Category	Acres	
Commercial/Employment	194.8	32.9%
Tax Exempt*	109.0	18.4%
Multi-Family Residential	108.9	18.4%
Rights-of-Way	160.0	16.8%
Industrial	26.3	4.4%
Vacant	23.0	3.9%
Single Family Residential	22.5	3.8%
Open Space*	8.1	1.4%
Total	**652.6**	**100.0%**

*Open space uses are also tax exempt uses, but are called out

separately in this table for illustrative purposes.
Source: 2000 RLIS Data, Metro

Most buildings in the Area were built between 1950 and 1980, with some notable exceptions like the Gateway Shopping Center, which was built in the 1980s. The median age for all buildings in the Area is 52 years. While the age of the building stock does not necessarily correlate with its overall condition, it does indicate that the Area has not yet experienced significant reinvestment district-wide. The lowest quality buildings are clustered in the Prunedale area, defined as the area zoned EG that is framed roughly by E Burnside, SE Stark, I-205 and SE 102nd.

The Area contains the highest-density commercial zoning designation in the city – CX or Central Commercial. With the exception of Floyd Light Middle School, the Area is zoned exclusively for commercial, employment and multifamily residential uses.

Local Zone	**Acres**	
Commercial Zones (CG, CM, CN2, CO1, CO2, CS,CX)	223.5	45.2%
Multi-Dwelling Zones (IR, R1, R2, R3, RH)	209.9	42.7%
Employment Zones (EG2)	32.1	6.5%
Single Dwelling Zones* (R5)	19.2	4.0%
Open Space (OS)	8.1	1.6%
Total**	**492.8**	**100.0%**

* The Floyd Light Middle School property (19.2 acres) is zoned R5, which is a single-dwelling residential zone.
** Zoning acreage does not include rights-of-way
Source: 2000 RLIS Data, Metro

3. Transportation and Infrastructure

Gateway's transportation infrastructure is unparalleled by any other area in the metro Portland region. The Area's proximity to two light-rail lines and two major interstates are both a benefit and a drawback to the Area.

<u>Public Transportation.</u> The Area is well served by public transportation, however the hub nature of the Regional Center for public transportation increases traffic congestion and noise pollution and discourages most pedestrian activity. Property near the Gateway Transit Center has seen disinvestment due to the impacts of bus and car traffic associated with the Transit Center. Redevelopment of high density commercial and housing land near the the Area's two light rail stations would be assisted by studies, plans, and physical improvements that help to better integrate the public transportation system with local street, bicycle and pedestrian networks.

The frequency and availability of public transportation service is generally excellent. In addition to the MAX light rail line – which now carries passengers west to downtown and east to Gresham, and soon north to Portland International Airport – Tri-Met operates 13 bus lines within or adjacent to the area, and operates a Transit Center at the Gateway MAX station. The north-south corridors of 99th, 102nd and the east-west Main Street corridor are completely within a quarter-mile of a bus line that runs every 10 minutes during peak hours. The Halsey-Weidler, Stark-Washington and Market street corridors are within a quarter-mile of 20-minute bus service. Only the Cherry Blossom corridor and the Glisan corridor lack 10- or 20- minute transit service, although Glisan does have hourly service.

Proposed public transit changes for September 2001 that affect the Area include increased frequency of service along Halsey, Stark and 102nd, and fewer transfers at the Gateway Transit Center.

<u>Streets.</u> Despite the Area's proximity to public transit, most people in the Area get around by driving alone. In 1994, 78 percent of home-based work trips by those who either work or live in the Area were completed using a single-occupied vehicle. The auto was also the transportation mode of choice for 95 percent of all other trips.

The Area is immediately adjacent to I-205 and I-84, resulting in high volume usage of NE Halsey, NE Glisan and SE Stark, the city's major east-west streets in the Area. Although there is an established network of local service streets in the Area, there is also congestion caused by regional through-traffic and a lack of connectivity in the local street network.

Several of the Area's key intersections rate poorly in terms of level of service, a qualitative measurement of roadway or intersection operation based on average-vehicle-delay or volume-to-capacity ratio measurements during peak travel times. On a letter-grade scale from A (free flowing traffic) to F (congestion), 13 of 17 roadway segments in the Area measured in 1998 were rated at D or worse. Three of 13 intersections were rated F in the morning and evening peak hours: NE Glisan/NE 102nd, NE Glisan/I-205 southbound ramps, and SE Washington/I-205 southbound ramps. Peak-hour traffic for southbound traffic on 99th Ave. at NE Glisan is particularly congested as well.

Although the majority of the area's roadways are in satisfactory physical condition, a Portland Office of Transportation (PDOT) analysis shows that they fail to meet the intersection spacing requirements of Metro's Functional Plan. Approximately 30 percent of the Area's blocks are longer than the Metro designated maximum of 530 feet. Metro's requirements are designed to provide more direct links to shorter local trips, leaving regional streets to carry through and longer-distance traffic. The effectiveness of the regional transportation system is reduced when local trips are forced onto the regional network due to a lack of connecting routes.

<u>Unimproved roads, curbs and sidewalks.</u> There are several unimproved roads located within the Area, most of which lie west of 99th between SE Stark and NE Glisan. These roads lack any right-of-way improvements, including paving, curbs and sidewalks. They are:

- SE Ash and SE Pine between 97th and 99th;

- NE Davis and NE Couch between 97th and I-205;
- SE 102nd between SE Morrison and SE Yamhill; and
- SE Yamhill between SE 102nd and SE Cherry Blossom.

Approximately 20 percent of the streets in the Gateway area do not have complete sidewalks and curbs that comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act and applicable citywide standards. Sidewalk segments are missing throughout the district, and are most notably absent in the southern portion of the Prunedale area. Nearly the entire length (0.5 miles) of SE 97th Avenue between Burnside and Stark is without sidewalks. In addition, most of the north-south avenues that intersect NE Halsey and NE Weidler lack sidewalks.

Bicycle routes. Presently, bike lanes exist only along two east-west corridors in the Area: the Halsey/Weidler and Burnside corridors. There are no bike lanes on north-south corridors except the dedicated pedestrian/bike trail between 96th and I-205 from Market to Stark.

Parking. Parking in the Area is characterized by both abundance and shortage: there is ample parking throughout the Area, but it is not located in the areas of highest demand. In 1998, a transportation consultant identified 12,602 on- and off-street parking spots in four subareas within the Area. PDOT reports that three of the four subareas show peak hour occupancy rates of 74 percent or below, within accepted standards for the provision of parking in urban areas. The Central subarea, containing the blocks south of Glisan and north of Stark, experienced the greatest demand for parking. During the subarea's peak hour of 11 a.m., there was a demand for 2,662 parking spaces from the area's existing supply of 2,517, resulting in 100-percent occupancy.

Although parking in the north subarea (containing the Gateway Transit Center Park and Ride lot and the Gateway Shopping Center lots) does not reach capacity, the Park and Ride is known to overflow with light rail and bus commuters on a daily basis.

4. Flooding and Drainage

According to 2000 Metro RLIS data, no portion of the Area exists within the 100-year floodplain. Some locations within the Area experience flooding during periods of heavy rain due to inefficient or nonexistent sumps. Stormwater drains are present at each intersection, but some drains feature sumps that do not meet the current city operating standards. As a result, areas with these sumps (as well as some of those without) often experience flooding during periods of heavy or prolonged precipitation. Stormwater drainage in the Prunedale area is especially poor. Several segments of 97th, 99th and 102nd avenues are completely lacking sumps, which often results in flooding at their intersection with Glisan, Burnside and Stark/Washington Streets.

Any significant increase in impervious surfaces in the Area would require immediate upgrades to the adjacent stormwater drainage system to reduce the possibility of flooding. The inefficient sump system, coupled with the likelihood of intensified development in the district, may ultimately require an Area-wide update of the stormwater drainage and treatment infrastructure.

5. Sewer System and Solid Waste Facilities
Most of the Area's existing sanitary sewer system was constructed and upgraded in the 1990s during the Mid-County Sewer Project. The Bureau of Environmental Services (BES) reports that the system has an anticipated lifespan of 50 to 100 years, and should be adequate to accommodate anticipated development.

There is currently adequate solid-waste collection, disposal and recycling in the Area. Eastside Waste & Recycling is the Area's franchised hauler for residential units (single family homes up to four-plexes). Sixty-seven haulers are permitted to provide service to commercial locations throughout Portland. BES does not anticipate problems in handling projected residential and commercial growth in the Area, according to Lee Barrett of the bureau.

The Area is centrally located between Metro's two regional transfer stations (Metro Center Station at 6161 NW 61st in Portland, and Metro South Station at 2001 Washington in Oregon City). The approximate travel time during non-peak hours to these locations is 20 minutes.

In addition, the Area is served by the nearby East County Recycling facility at 12409 NE San Rafael, which accepts non-putrescible waste including yard debris.

6. Parks, Open Spaces, and Public Facilities
The Area is in need of a significant amount of open space when current conditions are compared to City of Portland people-to-parks ratios. According to a 1999 Open Space Analysis, the Area currently needs a minimum of 17.5 acres of parkland for existing residents and workers if it is to meet the current citywide ratio of approximately 18.72 acres per 1,000 residents. To keep up with projected population increases over the next 20 years, the Area would need an additional 11 acres (for a total of 29 acres) of open space.

Currently the Area is home to approximately 5.5 acres of neighborhood parks, urban plazas and open spaces. Floyd Light Park and Park 51 at the eastern end of the Stark-Washington couplet are the two parks located within the district. Several community parks of nine acres or more and an additional 20 acres of neighborhood parks are located near the Area.

The Area is also home to the East Portland Community Center, one of 14 community centers within the City of Portland and the only community center east of I-205. Across the street from the Community Center are the East Portland Police Precinct and the East Portland Neighborhood Office. The Area also contains one school: Floyd Light Middle School, which is under the jurisdiction of the David Douglas School District. All of these public facilities are located in the southernmost portion of the Area.

7. Environmental

Environmental concerns in the Area include the stormwater drainage and treatment infrastructure and the possibility of brownfields. Primarily because of its location and historical uses, the Area is faced with few of the environmental concerns – such as habitat protection and restoration, widespread soil degradation and groundwater contamination – that confront redevelopment efforts elsewhere in the city.

Concerns about stormwater drainage and treatment infrastructure are described under an earlier heading, "Flooding and Drainage," in this section of the Report. The other significant environmental concern for the Area is the possibility of brownfields. Brownfields are sites with known or suspected soil or groundwater contamination, and are typically the result of prolonged exposure to toxic materials or equipment associated with industrial and commercial land uses. Although land in the Area historically has been used for agricultural and other relatively low-density uses, the Prunedale area — roughly bounded by E Burnside, SE Stark, I-205 and 102^{nd} — has housed light industrial uses, automotive service businesses and the outdoor storage of automotive machinery. In addition, underground oil tanks used to heat residential and commercial structures may have contaminated some sites. Bureau of Environmental Services (BES) records confirm that sites with known or suspected contamination are of minimal concern in the Area. However, the city continues to identify brownfield sites, and it is possible that contamination associated with the above uses may be present in the Area.

8. Water

Public water is currently supplied to the Area via a network of lines ranging from four inches to 12 inches in diameter. The City of Portland Bureau of Water Works detects no gross deficiencies in the existing water-line network, and considers this system adequate to provide necessary domestic and fire-protection usage.

A 1997 bureau review of the water system in the Area identified deficiencies in north-south supply mains and the need for improved east-west distribution capabilities. Deficiencies in north-south supply mains were recently addressed with the 36-inch Parkrose Supply Main Phase I. This main connects to an existing 48-inch main in NE 96^{th} Avenue near Mall 205, and extends north to SE Washington Street, east to 102^{nd} Avenue and north to Halsey Street. To address east-west distribution capabilities, a 12-inch diameter or larger east-west main is planned for SE Stark Street. This project has been in the Bureau's 10-year CIP planning horizon for several years, but scheduling is not firm. Also in the Bureau's 10-year CIP is the Parkrose Supply Main Phase II, which includes a large-diameter supply main in NE Halsey Street from 102^{nd} Avenue east to 148^{th} Avenue. Scheduling for this project is not firm.

The bureau says that off-site main improvements may be needed to provide domestic and fire supplies to new development projects. Necessary upgrades will depend on specific domestic and fire-flow requirements for any proposed development. In particular, off-site main improvements will probably be needed for proposed developments in areas currently served by six-inch and smaller distribution mains. New mains will need to be placed underneath any newly constructed or newly improved streets in the Area.

B. Social and Economic Conditions

1. Social Conditions

During the 1980s, the area of Portland that includes the Gateway Regional Center Urban Renewal Area experienced a population decline. Significant new housing construction and in-migration of large families reversed this decline during the 1990s. Today, households in the Gateway area tend to be larger than the City of Portland average, with young adult (20-34) and senior (65 and older) populations represented in proportions greater than the citywide average. In 1994, the Area was home to 1,570 households; recent data indicate an average density of 6.4 person/acre in the Area.

Over the next 20 years, E.D. Hovee and Company estimates increases in population and population diversity, and a decrease in average household size. Demand for housing is projected to come from the maturing local senior market currently housed in single-family neighborhoods encircling the Area. Employees working along the northern portion of the airport light-rail line may also create demand for Area housing.

Even with this expected growth, Gateway's commercial base will continue to rely on the larger mid/east county trade area, according to E.D. Hovee and Company. The expected population increase -- by itself, given area income levels -- will not be enough to achieve Metro's target densities, nor will it be enough to support the existing commercial base. Commercial and office expansion prospects will be somewhat constrained with the likely emergence of the airport-based CascadeStation development as a commercial/office location of choice for the next several years. CascadeStation and airport-based job growth is expected to stimulate housing development in Gateway, but the development will be limited by a scarcity of land and infeasible costs for high-density projects. As a result, the housing created as a result of new airport-area jobs will likely disperse along the I-205 and I-84 corridors, according to E.D. Hovee.

2. Economic Conditions

Despite the Area's advantageous location, the Area has not displayed significant commercial development over the past two decades and Area employees earn wages below the countywide average. Substantial acreage in the Regional Center is underdeveloped or undeveloped.

A key measure of the effective and productive utilization of land is an urban area is the ratio of improvement values to land values within the area. As public policy, it is desirable that well-located land in an urban area be intensely developed, and developed to its best economic use. In areas that have the benefit of significant public investment (utilities, public transportation, parks, etc.), the value of the improvement should be many times the value of the land. The ratio of improvement to land values in the Area does not meet this test. The ratio of real market improvement values to real market land values in the Area for the 1999-2000 tax year was 2.08:1.

The Area currently combines elements of very low-density development, deteriorated buildings and vacant land which combine to discourage new building investments. The low ratio of improvement to land values in the Area reflects the static or declining improvement values of the many older properties in the district. The median building age in the Area is 52 years.

The decline of the building stock in the Area combined with the longstanding absence of redevelopment is an adverse economic condition for the Regional Center. Actions to be undertaken in the Urban Renewal Plan are intended to prepare the Area for becoming a center for quality jobs and to increase the Area's taxable values. The Plan is intended to stimulate economic development of both large and small businesses. The Urban Renewal Plan describes goals to provide quality jobs in the Area. These goals will be achieved through the application of urban renewal tools including land assembly, low-interest loans, storefront grants, employee investment incentives, relocation incentives, and infrastructure improvements potentially to include telecommunication wiring.

In 1994, the Area was home to approximately 12,450 jobs. Roughly half of Area businesses have fewer than five employees, and nearly 90 percent of have fewer than 20, according to a 2000 phone survey of Area businesses. Most of these employees come from the East Portland and East County areas. Most businesses (60 percent) in the Area are single location, independent firms, and the median tenure of businesses in the Area is 10 years. Sixty-five percent of the businesses considered the Area "Good" or "Very Good" for business, with 36 percent citing convenience to employees as the top locational advantage.

Health-related services, retail stores, eating and drinking establishments, and personal services are the four most common types of Area businesses. Employment in the southern half of the Area is largely concentrated in just a handful of job sectors, primarily health services, eating and drinking establishments and miscellaneous retail, while job sectors in the northern half include a wider variety of services.

Wages in the Area lag behind those of Multnomah County. The average wage in Multnomah County for 1999 was approximately $33,040 a year, or about $16/hour. According to the results of the phone survey, the average hourly wage for full-time employees in the Area is approximately $25,000 a year, or $13/hour – 76 percent of the countywide average. According to research by ED Hovee and Company, overall wages in the greater Gateway area are 86 percent of the countywide average.

Total Assessed Value in Area – Compliance with 15 Percent Requirement

ORS 457.420(2)(a)(A) provides that the assessed value of an urban renewal area, when added to the total assessed values previously certified by the assessor for all other urban renewal areas, may not exceed 15 percent of the total assessed value of the municipality. This limitation is exclusive of any increased assessed value for other urban renewal areas.

Data assembled from the Multnomah County Assessor indicates that the 2000-2001 total assessed valuation for real property within the proposed urban renewal area boundary is

$259,158,690. The table below shows the certified values for all of Portland's renewal areas, and how the assessed value in the Gateway Regional Center Urban Renewal Area would affect the 15 percent limitation.

District/Area	Base Assessed Value
Interstate Corridor	$1,019,794,975
Lents Town Center	$620,720,135
South Park Blocks	$378,055,680
River District	$358,684,364
Convention Center	$247,502,688
Central Eastside	$224,605,349
North Macadam	$180,450,967
Airport Way	$129,701,175
Downtown Waterfront	$70,866,644
Gateway Regional Center	***$259,158,690***
Total Certified Assessed Values, all URAs	$3,489,540,677
Total Assessed Value, City of Portland	$31,885,995,512
Percent of Portland AV in URAs (including Gateway)	10.9

*Dollar amounts represent current frozen base assessed values and have not been adjusted for inflation.

The table above illustrates that with the addition of the Gateway Regional Center Urban Renewal Area, the base assessed values within urban renewal areas remain below 15 percent of the City of Portland's total assessed value.

SECTION III. EXPECTED IMPACT, INCLUDING FISCAL IMPACT, OF THE PLAN IN LIGHT OF ADDED SERVICES OR INCREASED POPULATION

The Hovee analysis concludes that 3,790 new housing units and 9,808 new jobs will be created in the project area over a 20-year period, assuming the establishment of the urban renewal area.

Urban renewal activities shown in Section VII of the Gateway Regional Center Urban Renewal Plan are intended to allow use of tax increment funds to remedy the conditions of blight described in this report. The estimated cost of implementing the Gateway Regional Center Urban Renewal Plan is largely driven by anticipated expenditures to address significant needs in transportation, open spaces, housing and economic development in the Area.

Many positive impacts are expected from improvements made to enhance the Gateway Regional Center Urban Renewal Area. Most result from fulfilling the vision of Gateway as a Regional Center. They include:

- Additional parks and open spaces
- Improved traffic management
- Greater access, additional routes and improved safety for pedestrians

- More civic and cultural amenities
- Optimal utilization of transit throughout the Area
- Better quality design on public and private land

Growth resulting from the Area will affect police service, fire protection and parks maintenance. The following table projects additional operating expenses in 2022 from two of these service increases.

City Expenditure Category	Assumptions/Standards	2022 Build-Out Cost Estimate
Police Service	2 officers per 1000 residents at $112,000 each*	$896,000
Parks Maintenance	$12,140 per acre**	$131,112
Total		**$4,363,233**

*Assumes population growth attributable to urban renewal is 3,710
**Assumes 10.8 new acres of parkland. Cost based on averages developed for Interstate URA.

The Area is served by three city Fire and Emergency Stations: No. 19 (7301 E. Burnside), No. 41 (1500 SE 122nd) and No. 43 (13313 NE San Rafael). Portland Bureau of Fire, Rescue and Emergency Services reports that growth resulting from urban renewal is not likely to significantly increase the need for fire protection in the Area.

Taxpayers in the Area will pay the same rate for services that they currently pay. These taxpayers might feel a slight impact in voter-approved or local option levies.

Carrying out the Renewal Plan will require the use of tax increment revenues. With the passage of Ballot Measure 50, the basic fiscal impacts of utilizing tax increment financing have changed. Use of tax increment financing may result in some "foregone" property tax revenues by other taxing bodies. While some property taxes will be foregone during the life of the Plan, new property values created by urban renewal activities (i.e., values that would not have been created without urban renewal) will benefit all taxing jurisdictions after the urban renewal indebtedness is retired. Given the current market conditions within the Gateway Regional Center Urban Renewal Area, it is reasonable to assume that the increases in property values would be much lower if the urban renewal activities were not carried out. These assumptions are supported by the Hovee analysis, which projects that only 1,140 new housing units and 2,811 new jobs would be created in the next 20 years without urban renewal.

Additional tax impacts of carrying out the Gateway Regional Center Urban Renewal Plan, and the new property values expected in the project area, are addressed in later sections of this report.

SECTION IV. REASONS FOR SELECTION OF EACH URBAN RENEWAL AREA IN THE PLAN

There is only one urban renewal area proposed in the Plan. Conditions exist within the Gateway Regional Center Urban Renewal Area which meet the definitions of blight in ORS 457.010(1).

Evidence of blight, which can be manifest in either physical or economic conditions, is present throughout the district. The Area exhibits the following symptoms of blight as described in (a) – (h):

(a)(A) Defective design and quality of physical construction.
Dilapidated and poorly constructed buildings in the Prunedale area – bounded roughly by E Burnside, I-205, SE Stark and SE 102nd – represent a visual blight and pose a threat to public safety. Buildings are not designed to encourage walking and use of public transportation. Low-quality physical construction is present along 102nd.

(a)(B) Faulty interior arrangement and exterior spacing.
The Area is characterized by inefficient layout of tax lots, an incomplete local street grid, and large parcels that are difficult to access.

(a)(D) Inadequate provision for ventilation, light, sanitation, open spaces and recreation facilities.
Open space deficiencies apply to all but the southernmost part of the Area, depriving residents and workers of adequate recreation space.

(a)(E) Obsolescence, deterioration, dilapidation, mixed character or a shifting of uses.
Certain structures are in a state of disrepair or are obsolete due to age. The median age for Area structures is 52 years. Disinvestment is present in all areas between I-205, 102nd, NE Pacific and SE Stark. Almost all land in this area exhibits a disorderly mix of uses — single-family homes sit next to salvage yards, for example — creating problems for residents and businesses alike.

(b) An economic dislocation, deterioration or disuse of property resulting from faulty planning.
Inadequate land-use planning is partly responsible for the Area's limited commercial reinvestment during the past 30 years. Areas well-served by public transit continue to be used for incompatible low-density land uses such as auto repair shops and auto-oriented shopping malls. The former bowling alley at 104th and Wasco is a high-profile example of a property that is deteriorating because of a lack of street access. Faulty planning has also resulted in lot sizes ranging from less than 500 feet to 19.5 acres.

(c) The division or subdivision and sale of property or lots of irregular form or shape and inadequate size or dimensions for property usefulness and development.
Tax lots throughout the Area are irregularly shaped and follow no logical pattern, qualities that frustrate redevelopment attempts, limit access from right-of-ways, and contribute to a haphazard street grid. Several lots throughout the district are too small – including some only 435 square feet in size – to enable economically feasible redevelopment.

(d) The laying out of property or lots in disregard of contours, drainage and other physical characteristics of the terrain and surrounding conditions;
This was not found to be a blighting condition in the Area.

(e) The existence of inadequate streets and other rights of way, open spaces and utilities.
Much of the Area's street grid is broken up, resulting in one-third of the blocks exceeding the maximum length allowed by Metro. The Area has no east-west streets between 97th Ave and 102nd Ave from Halsey to Burnside, a distance of 0.8 miles. Between Burnside and SE Stark there are two dead-end east-west streets and no north-south streets between 99th and 102nd; a similar breakdown in the street grid occurs east of 102nd between Halsey and Burnside. The lack of a sensible street grid system creates traffic bottlenecks, impedes the mobility of local residents by bus, car and on foot, and limits access to many properties.

(f) The existence of property or lots or other areas that are subject to inundation by water;
Segments of 97th, 99th, and 102nd lack sumps and flooding is frequently present during periods of heavy or prolonged precipitation where these streets intersect SE Stark/Washington, Burnside and Glisan.

(g) A prevalence of depreciated values, impaired investments and social and economic maladjustments to such an extent that the capacity to pay taxes is reduced and tax receipts are inadequate for the cost of public services rendered.
Existing property values and associated tax receipts are depreciated due to scarcity of "highest and best" land uses based on zoning and plans for the Area. The median age of the improvements (52 years) indicates that the Area has not undergone significant reinvestment since it was initially built out, despite significant transportation improvements like the Banfield light rail system and I-205.

(h) A growing or total lack of proper utilization of areas, resulting in a stagnant and unproductive condition of land potentially useful and valuable for contributing to the public health, safety and welfare. Widespread disparity throughout the Area between existing land uses and land use potential, based on zoning and other adopted land-use regulations, especially along north-south streets between and including 97th and 102nd. The average improvement-to-land

ratio is 2.08:1. Despite high-density zoning in much of the district, little to no high-density development has occurred. Despite the presence of two light-rail stations, little to no transit-oriented development has occurred. Despite the growing utilization of the land for housing, little to no open space development has occurred.

SECTION V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EACH PROJECT ACTIVITY TO BE UNDERTAKEN UNDER THE PLAN AND THE EXISTING CONDITIONS

All project activities described in Section VII of the Plan are intended to correct the deficiencies described in Section II.A. and II.B. of this Report, and summarized in Section IV of this Report.

A comparison of Plan activities authorized in Section VII with the deficiencies noted in Section II of this Report shows that there is a direct relationship between each project activity and method authorized in the Plan, and treatment of existing conditions in the Gateway Regional Center Urban Renewal Area. Methods and activities authorized in the Plan include: redevelopment through new construction, acquisition and redevelopment, and disposition of land; improvements of public rights-of-way, transit systems and infrastructure; and financial assistance for job creation, wealth creation and relocation.

The principles listed in Section IV of the Plan identify the goals and objectives that will guide the effort to alter the conditions indicated in Section II of this Report, and summarized in Section IV of this Report. These principles include one standing principle and ten subordinate principles, and are based on the *Opportunity Gateway Concept Plan and Redevelopment Strategy,* a vision document authored by a community advisory group and accepted by City Council in February 2000. These principles also reflect the input of citizens over the course of planning for the Gateway Regional Center Urban Renewal Area.

The expenditures proposed for the urban renewal area, and presented in Exhibit 2, are divided into seven categories which correspond with the Principles, Goals and Objectives listed in Section IV of the Plan that will require the outlay of capital.

Following is a general description by category of how the activities undertaken in the Plan will alleviate the blighted conditions described in this Report:

Transportation

Transportation improvements will seek to mitigate the causes of blight that are exacerbated by the inadequacy of the local street system. These include service improvements at the lowest performing intersections and street segments, safety measures at busy intersections and streets, congestion management measures, improved distribution of on-street parking and an overall upgrade to the bicycle and pedestrian systems. A Street Plan will guide the construction of new street connections which will enable more efficient travel through the district and new development in what are now poorly accessible parts of the Area. Included in this category are transit improvements that will promote ridership, reduce usage demand on the streets and enable higher densities within the district to support expanded commercial and other services.

Housing

Some housing in the Area meets the definition of blight because of its deteriorated physical construction or poorly planned physical environment. Some housing is not physically blighted, yet exists in a patchwork assembly of "mixed character and a shifting of uses." With the exception of the newest projects, the housing supply represents a "growing lack of proper utilization" of the area due to its low-density configuration.

The Plan calls for increasing the mix and assuring the diversity of housing resources for current and future residents in the Gateway area. This policy goal is supported by the Outer Southeast Community Plan and the Hazelwood Neighborhood Plan. The Outer Southeast Community Plan, which includes the Gateway district, set a goal of developing 14,000 new housing units over the next twenty years for the entire Outer Southeast area. PDC's Urban Renewal Feasibility Study projects an increase of 2,650 dwelling units with urban renewal in the Gateway district over the next twenty years. Without Urban Renewal, the Gateway area will continue to develop but not at a pace to achieve these projections.

The character, quality and composition of future housing development will be guided by a Housing Strategy, to be completed under the direction of the Plan. The Strategy will seek to develop a range of housing products for the Area that are compatible with both the housing market and community's desires. Through a stakeholder process, housing study and careful setting of priorities, the community will help determine what programs and projects should be implemented with tax-increment financing and other housing program resources. The Strategy will help develop tools to achieve a mix of both rental and homeownership units that are affordable to new and existing residents. Programs and projects will respond to issues of neighborhood compatibility, design and concerns about displacement.

Transit-Oriented Development

The Regional Center's two light rail stations and one Transit Center represent significant public investments. The Regional Center has been designated, zoned and planned for development that promotes transit ridership and compatibility between private and public investments along the light rail line. Despite these regulatory measures, the existing pattern of land use in the district continues to cater to automobile usage almost exclusively. Neither private nor public entities have adequately supported the initial investment in transit with development and amenities that reward the choice to use transit.

The Plan seeks to address this condition through land assembly and financing availability for transit-oriented projects. These are generally assumed to be new development projects or expansions with a one-quarter mile distance of a light rail station, with lower than conventional parking ratios and a mixture of uses. Because of the higher costs associated with transit-oriented projects, the Plan anticipates setting aside a dedicated funding allotment for this type of development.

Parks and Public Space

Open space in Gateway is currently used for cars, either in the form of parking lots or streets. There is inadequate open space for people to recreate, stroll, rest or walk. Public spaces are likewise lacking throughout the district. The Plan seeks to correct this imbalance while anticipating the growing need for open space that will accompany population growth. Expenditures are called out for land acquisition and land development as parks/plazas, recreational facilities and small public spaces. This category of expenditure seeks to address some of the goals and objectives listed under principle six in the Plan. The projects under this principle should be diverse enough to meet the many needs of new and existing residents and employees in the area.

Economic Development

Gateway's economic development is subject to a myriad of conditions, many addressed in the Plan principles. Included in this catch-all are the goals of employment growth, small business assistance and wealth-creation. The Outer Southeast Community Plan identifies a goal of 6,000 new jobs in the plan area over 20 years, many of which to be concentrated in the Gateway Regional Center. There has been limited commercial reinvestment in Gateway over the past 30 years, due in part to faulty planning in the Area. Many properties are difficult to access. Others are too small to redevelop according to their zoning. Standard indicators like average income indicate the Regional Center population as less well-off than most others in the metropolitan region.

The Plan's economic development component includes the provision of an Economic Development strategy which will help direct economic development-related expenditures over the life of the URA. Particular areas of focus will be site assembly for large, high-quality job providers, employment recruitment and retention strategies, and small business assistance programs to retain the locally-owned and operated storefront character in the Area.

Regional Center Identifiers

The Regional Center Identifier category addresses the qualitative issues that are commonly held by members of the Gateway community. Judicious urban design and attentiveness to design details in both the public and private realms can serve to bolster and complement other investments in the Area, furthering additional Plan principles. Key features of the Regional Center will include new signage, public art and design standards that give the Center a cohesive identity that is easily understood and appreciated by pedestrians and motorists. The Plan is set up to fund a Quality Development Program that will enable citizens, developers and land use professionals to discuss, evaluate and negotiate the design decisions that will ultimately add up to a high-quality environment with a strong and clear identity.

Public Facilities

Gateway currently has several public facilities for a district its size, including the East Portland Community Center, the East Portland Police Precinct, Floyd Light Middle School and the soon to be completed Children's Receiving Center. Public facilities are destinations that serve regional populations and are therefore appropriate to the Regional Center. The Gateway community has expressed a strong interest in seeing the Regional Center support public facilities that serve the needs of this particular part of the Portland metro region; these might include arts facilities, education facilities and/or government facilities. The urban renewal district will not have the financial capacity to realize all such projects. Expenditures are proposed, however, for site assembly and support for one such facility, should an opportunity become available to site such a building in the Area later in the life of the Plan. In addition, expenditures are anticipated for partnerships with local area educational districts and institutions that have expressed interest in contributing to Area's overall revitalization.

In summary, project activities authorized in the Plan further the stated Plan goals and City goals of creating new housing and jobs within the project area, along with related community investments necessary to support a growing population. The Portland Development Commission may acquire, improve and dispose of property for redevelopment in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan, Zoning Ordinance and specific Plan objectives. The detailed provisions pertaining to these activities are described in Sections VII and VIII of the Plan. The Commission may also undertake planning for potential projects to achieve the Plan's goals and objectives.

Specific public improvements include the construction, reconstruction, repair or replacement of sidewalks, streets, transit systems, parking, parks, pedestrian amenities, water, sanitary sewer and storm sewer facilities and other public infrastructure deemed appropriate for the achievement of the goals and objectives of the Plan.

The Portland Development Commission will undertake loans and grant programs to assist property owners in rehabilitating or redeveloping property within the Area to achieve the objectives of the Plan. This may include residential, commercial or industrial loans or grants, financial assistance to improve older buildings to meet current code standards (including seismic standards), assistance to remediate harmful environmental conditions, or other programs to eliminate blight in the area.

All of these activities will address the underutilization of land in the Area.

SECTION VI. ESTIMATED TOTAL COST OF EACH PROJECT AND SOURCES OF MONIES TO PAY SUCH COSTS

Estimated costs are shown in Exhibit 1, Project Revenue and Expenditure Summary. Expenditures over the life of the Plan include an inflation estimate. Revenues are obtained from anticipated urban renewal bond proceeds and the proceeds of short-term urban renewal notes.

The capacity for urban renewal bonds is based on projections of urban renewal revenue, which in turn are based on projections of development within the Area. Projections of development within the Area correspond to the 20-year build-out estimates for housing, retail and office development.

Total estimated project costs over the life of the plan total $125,400,000 including inflation estimates. Without inflation estimates, estimated project costs total approximately $99,867,374. Revenue is sufficient to cover project expenditures, as Exhibit 1 Demonstrates.

SECTION VII. ANTICIPATED COMPLETION DATE FOR EACH PROJECT

The schedule of each urban renewal project is shown on Exhibit 1. Project activities are anticipated to be undertaken starting in Fiscal Year (FY) 2002/2003, ending in FY 2021/2022.

SECTION VIII. ESTIMATED AMOUNT OF MONEY REQUIRED IN THE URBAN RENEWAL AREA UNDER ORS 457.420 TO 457.460 (TAX INCREMENT FINANCING OF URBAN RENEWAL INDEBTEDNESS) AND ANTICIPATED YEAR IN WHICH INDEBTEDNESS WILL BE RETIRED OR OTHERWISE PROVIDED FOR UNDER ORS 457.420 TO 457.460

The maximum indebtedness under the Plan will be $164,240,000 a figure that reflects project activities, Area management and reserve requirements. No additional indebtedness would be incurred under the Plan when either the maximum indebtedness amount is reached, or the urban renewal area no longer has indebtedness or any plan to incur indebtedness within the next year, whichever occurs first. No bonds will be sold after FY 2021-22 and taxes will cease to be divided for urban renewal when the amount on deposit in the debt fund is sufficient to pay the outstanding indebtedness.

SECTION IX. FINANCIAL ANALYSIS OF THE PLAN WITH SUFFICIENT INFORMATION TO DETERMINE FEASIBILITY

Exhibit 1 demonstrates that projected tax increment proceeds are sufficient to cover projected expenditures and that the Plan is financially feasible.

Exhibit 1 also demonstrates that projected urban renewal taxes are sufficient to support the bonded indebtedness necessary to provide project revenues. Additional revenue may be provided by short-term urban renewal notes repaid on an annual basis from the ending fund balances.

SECTION X. FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT THAT ESTIMATES IMPACT OF TAX INCREMENT FINANCING, BOTH UNTIL AND AFTER INDEBTEDNESS IS REPAID, UPON ALL ENTITIES LEVYING TAXES UPON PROPERTY IN URBAN RENEWAL AREA

Amendments to the Oregon Constitution passed by voters in May 1997 resulted in a shift in Oregon's property tax system. The tax bases and most continuing levies of taxing districts were reduced and then converted to "permanent rates." These rates were sufficient to raise, in Fiscal Year (FY) 1997/98, the amount of revenue that each taxing district was authorized to levy.

In FY 1998/99 and subsequent years, the maximum revenues of each taxing district with a permanent rate will be determined by applying the permanent rate to the assessed value within the taxing district. Under this system of taxation, the fiscal impacts of urban renewal consist primarily of tax revenues foregone by taxing districts.

To a lesser extent, impacts in terms of increased tax rates to taxpayers will result from any levy other than permanent rates. For example, if voters approve a local-option levy or exempt-bond levy, the tax rate necessary to raise the amount approved may be higher as a result of the existence of the Plan.

Exhibit 2 projects the amount of tax revenue that will be foregone by each district over a 25-year period. By the end of FY 2026-27, sufficient urban renewal tax revenue is projected to be available to retire all outstanding bonded indebtedness necessary to finance the plan. Urban renewal taxes would therefore be projected to cease after FY 2026-27. The foregone revenues are those revenues resulting from taxes on the level of development that would occur without urban renewal. The projection with urban renewal assumes new development resulting from urban renewal, as well as new development naturally occurring in the market. The permanent rates are based on FY 2000-01 rates. No other adjustments were made since many of them require voter approval or will not exist for a significant duration of the plan.

SECTION XI. RELOCATION REPORT

A. An Analysis of Existing Residences or Businesses Required to Relocate
No existing residences or businesses have been identified as required to relocate.

B. A Description of the Relocation Methods to be Used
If any residences or businesses are required to relocate, the Portland Development Commission will provide assistance in finding replacement facilities to persons or businesses displaced. All persons or businesses to be displaced will be contacted to determine such relocation needs. They will be provided information on available space and will be given assistance in moving. All relocation activities will be undertaken and payments made in accordance with the requirements of ORS 281.045-281.105 and any other applicable laws or regulations. Relocation payments will be made as provided in ORS 281.060. Payments made to persons displaced from dwellings will assure that they will have available to them decent, safe and sanitary dwellings at costs or rents within their financial reach. Payment for moving expenses will be made to displaced businesses.

The Commission has prepared and maintains information in its office relating to the relocation program and procedures, including eligibility for and amounts of relocation payments, services available and other relevant matters.

C. An Enumeration by Cost Range, of Housing Units to be Removed or Altered
At this time, the Commission does not anticipate the removal or alteration of any housing units through its actions.

D. An Enumeration by Cost Range, of New Housing Units to be Added
The current estimate of housing production for the Area anticipates 3,790 units over the 20-year life of the Plan. The Plan calls for the creation of a housing strategy, which will serve to guide future housing-related urban renewal investments. Urban renewal funds will be used as a direct subsidy for housing production to accomplish the City's adopted housing policies and to fulfill the community's expectations regarding housing in the area.

EXHIBIT 1: GATEWAY REGIONAL CENTER URBAN RENEWAL EXPENDITURE ESTIMATES																					
Project/Program Expenditure Activity	Total w/																				
	Inflation	02-03	03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07	07-08	08-09	09-10	10-11	11-12	12-13	13-14	14-15	15-16	16-17	17-18	18-19	19-20	20-21	21-22
REVENUES																					
Annual Bond Proceeds	**114,250,000**	2,500,000	2,500,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,500,000	3,750,000	4,000,000	4,500,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,500,000	8,000,000	9,000,000	9,000,000	9,000,000	9,000,000
Annual Du Jour Proceeds	**49,990,958**	274,038	494,973	603,088	606,464	777,491	993,570	1,165,691	1,573,359	1,726,102	1,884,070	2,209,439	2,579,379	2,890,254	3,316,421	3,741,892	4,167,660	4,543,335	4,974,091	5,461,683	6,007,959
	164,240,958	**2,774,038**	**2,994,973**	**3,603,088**	**3,606,464**	**4,277,491**	**4,743,570**	**5,165,691**	**6,073,359**	**6,726,102**	**6,884,070**	**8,209,439**	**8,579,379**	**9,890,254**	**10,316,421**	**11,241,892**	**12,167,660**	**13,543,335**	**13,974,091**	**14,461,683**	**15,007,959**
EXPENDITURES																					
TRANSPORTATION																					
Boulevard & Collectors	**14,187,250**									800,000	1,559,250	1,475,000			1,559,500	1,000,000	1,559,500	1,559,500	1,559,500	1,559,500	1,555,500
Traffic Operations Improvements	**1,785,500**	634,500	514,000	116,000												521,000					
Local Streets	**10,300,570**	708,750	708,750	710,000				315,770	682,000	702,200	862,000		880,000	882,000		200,000	500,000	787,500	787,500	787,000	787,100
Transit Improvements	**1,120,000**							280,000			280,000			280,000			280,000				
Total Transportation	**27,393,320**																				
HOUSING																					
Housing Strategy	**200,000**	50,000	50,000						50,000					50,000							
Acquisition	**5,153,000**	250,000	209,000	260,000					500,000	600,000		250,000	500,000	500,000	550,000	250,000	500,000	500,000	284,000		
Housing Development - Ownership	**5,382,000**			156,250	156,250	156,250	156,250	625,000	625,000			382,000	625,000	625,000	625,000	625,000	625,000				
Housing Development - Rental	**9,412,800**				315,200	315,200	315,200	715,200	715,200	715,200		600,000	715,200	715,200	715,200	715,200	715,200	715,200	715,200	715,200	
Total Housing	**20,147,800**																				
TRANSIT-ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT																					
Acquisition	**4,600,000**			750,000			250,000					300,000			320,000	1,000,000		980,000			1,000,000
Mixed-Use Financing	**2,070,000**						350,000						340,000	360,000				310,000	370,000	340,000	
Structured Parking	**6,709,000**				714,000	1,015,000	300,000		800,000	910,000			800,000	800,000	800,000		570,000				
Total Transit-Oriented-Dev.	**13,379,000**																				
PARKS AND PUBLIC SPACES																					
Acquisition	**1,981,500**		250,000	175,000										500,000	513,500					543,000	
Recreational Facilities	**3,300,000**						1,000,000	1,000,000								600,000		700,000			
Small Public Spaces	**400,000**	20,000	20,000	20,000			25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
Parks & Plaza	**3,103,000**				850,000	553,000											500,000		200,000		1,000,000
Total Parks and Public Spaces	**8,784,500**																				
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT																					
Site Assembly	**2,100,000**										800,000	1,300,000									
Economic Development Strategy	**151,500**	15,000			50,500			21,000				45,000				20,000					
Employment Recruitment & Retention	**850,000**										150,000					250,000	250,000			200,000	
Small Business Assistance	**388,700**	72,000	70,000	4,500					75,700	79,000	87,500										
Total Ec. Dev.	**3,490,200**																				
REGIONAL CENTER IDENTIFIERS																					
Signage & Public Art	**1,009,000**				116,000	115,000	125,000							285,500				147,000		110,000	110,500
Design Guidelines & Standards	**110,000**		50,000	60,000																	
District Gateways	**490,000**					240,000										250,000					
Quality Development Program	**305,500**	30,000	30,000	30,000			30,500	32,500	32,500			30,000	30,000	30,000	30,000						
Total Regional Center Identifiers	**1,914,500**																				

Project/Program Expenditure Activity	Total w/ Inflation	02-03	03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07	07-08	08-09	09-10	10-11	11-12	12-13	13-14	14-15	15-16	16-17	17-18	18-19	19-20	20-21	21-22
PUBLIC FACILITIES																					
Site Assembly	2,024,000																224,000	500,000	1,300,000		
Undetermined Facility	3,928,000												573,000						500,000	1,000,000	1,855,000
Educational Facilities Support	2,000,000					200,000	300,000												500,000	1,000,000	
Total Public Facilities	7,952,000																				
Total Project Expenditures	83,061,320	1,780,250	1,901,750	2,281,750	2,201,950	2,594,450	2,851,950	3,014,470	3,505,400	3,831,400	3,763,750	4,407,000	4,488,200	5,052,700	5,133,200	5,451,200	5,743,700	6,219,200	6,236,200	6,274,700	6,328,100
Program Management & Administration	8,500,000	425,000	425,000	425,000	425,000	425,000	425,000	425,000	425,000	425,000	425,000	425,000	425,000	425,000	425,000	425,000	425,000	425,000	425,000	425,000	425,000
Project Contingency	8,306,054	178,024	190,175	228,175	220,195	259,445	285,195	301,447.00	350,540	383,140.00	376,375	440,700	448,820	505,270	513,320	545,120	574,370	621,920	623,620	627,470	632,733
Total Program Exp. - 2001 Dollars	99,867,374	2,383,274	2,516,925	2,934,925	2,847,145	3,278,895	3,562,145	3,740,917	4,280,940	4,639,540	4,565,125	5,272,700	5,362,020	5,982,970	6,071,520	6,421,320	6,743,070	7,266,120	7,284,820	7,327,170	7,385,833
Total Program Exp. - with Inflation	149,966,344	2,459,539	2,680,586	3,225,790	3,229,449	3,838,186	4,303,183	4,663,757	5,507,782	6,160,163	6,255,322	7,456,066	7,825,008	9,010,583	9,436,549	10,299,586	11,161,764	12,412,447	12,842,612	13,330,625	13,867,348
Bond Fees and Reserves	14,263,656	314,177	314,177	377,013	377,013	439,848	439,848	502,684	565,519	565,519	628,355	754,026	754,026	879,697	879,697	942,532	1,005,368	1,131,039	1,131,039	1,131,039	1,131,039
Total Gateway Urban Renewal	164,230,000	2,773,716	2,994,763	3,602,803	3,606,462	4,278,034	4,743,031	5,166,441	6,073,301	6,725,682	6,883,677	8,210,092	8,579,034	9,890,280	10,316,246	11,242,118	12,167,132	13,543,486	13,973,651	14,461,664	14,998,387
Surplus/Deficit	10,958	321	210	285	2	(544)	539	(750)	58	420	393	(653)	346	(26)	175	(226)	528	(151)	440	19	9,572
Cumulative Surplus/Deficit		321	531	816	818	275	813	63	121	541	934	282	627	601	776	551	1,079	928	1,367	1,386	10,958
Inflated - Projects only	125,398,569	1,837,218	2,025,409	2,507,882	2,497,619	3,036,993	3,445,245	3,758,104	4,509,986	5,087,153	5,157,245	6,231,889	6,549,808	7,609,561	7,978,182	8,743,546	9,507,512	10,624,032	10,993,971	11,415,823	11,881,391

Gateway Urban Renewal
Estimated Foregone Taxes

Fiscal Year	Permanent Rate	Frozen Base 01-02	02-03	03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07	07-08	08-09	09-10	10-11	11-12
Total Assessed Value with UR		259,158,690	287,378,962	312,312,323	333,845,101	349,820,324	377,467,859	408,713,918	438,872,180	484,167,609	518,458,311	553,070,204
Total Assessed Value without UR			280,928,096	304,248,878	323,050,954	335,906,180	351,657,904	369,933,753	386,472,381	417,475,098	436,775,645	455,674,849
AV without UR Less Frozen Base			21,769,406	45,090,188	63,892,264	76,747,490	92,499,214	110,775,063	127,313,691	158,316,408	177,616,955	196,516,159
Taxing District:												
*Multnomah County (w/ Library levy)	4.9381		101,050	210,913	300,722	363,053	438,452	525,593	604,869	751,257	844,382	935,307
City of Portland	4.5770		93,660	195,490	278,732	336,505	406,390	487,158	560,638	696,321	782,637	866,912
Metro	0.0966		1,977	4,126	5,883	7,102	8,577	10,282	11,833	14,696	16,518	18,297
Port of Portland	0.0701		1,434	2,994	4,269	5,154	6,224	7,461	8,587	10,665	11,987	13,277
David Douglas Public School	4.6394		89,293	186,604	264,846	316,671	380,540	455,209	522,255	652,114	731,686	808,937
Parkrose Public School	4.8906		5,949	12,177	18,643	25,744	33,090	40,681	48,518	56,608	64,958	73,573
Mult Co. Educ. Service Dist.	0.4576		9,364	19,545	27,867	33,643	40,630	48,705	56,052	69,617	78,247	86,672
Mt. Hood Community College	0.4416		9,037	18,861	26,893	32,467	39,209	47,002	54,092	67,183	75,511	83,642

Fiscal Year	Permanent Rate	12-13	13-14	14-15	15-16	16-17	17-18	18-19	19-20	20-21	21-22	22-23
Total Assessed Value with UR		602,011,161	653,084,836	706,364,614	765,667,006	827,520,971	892,013,468	959,233,946	1,029,274,387	1,102,229,376	1,178,196,147	1,248,887,916
Total Assessed Value without UR		478,846,919	501,962,723	525,940,307	551,826,911	578,584,207	606,337,684	635,119,160	664,961,337	695,897,813	727,963,109	757,081,634
AV without UR Less Frozen Base		219,688,229	242,804,033	266,781,617	292,668,221	319,425,517	347,178,994	375,960,470	405,802,647	436,739,123	468,804,419	497,922,944
Taxing District:												
*Multnomah County (w/ Library levy)	4.9381	1,045,866	1,156,381	1,271,000	1,394,597	1,522,435	1,655,061	1,792,615	1,935,247	2,083,113	2,236,379	2,376,129
City of Portland	4.5770	969,386	1,071,820	1,178,058	1,292,617	1,411,107	1,534,034	1,661,530	1,793,731	1,930,785	2,072,843	2,202,373
Metro	0.0966	20,459	22,621	24,864	27,281	29,782	32,377	35,067	37,858	40,750	43,748	46,482
Port of Portland	0.0701	14,847	16,416	18,043	19,797	21,612	23,495	25,448	27,472	29,571	31,747	33,731
David Douglas Public School	4.6394	903,958	998,641	1,096,877	1,202,710	1,312,607	1,426,670	1,545,020	1,667,785	1,795,102	1,927,114	2,044,008
Parkrose Public School	4.8906	82,903	92,545	102,507	113,351	124,112	135,224	146,697	158,545	170,778	183,410	198,592
Mult Co. Educ. Service Dist.	0.4576	96,917	107,159	117,780	129,233	141,080	153,370	166,117	179,334	193,036	207,239	220,189
Mt. Hood Community College	0.2828	93,529	103,412	113,662	124,715	136,147	148,007	160,308	173,064	186,287	199,993	212,490

Fiscal Year	Permanent Rate	23-24	24-25	25-26	26-27	Total
Total Assessed Value with UR		1,323,821,191	1,403,250,462	1,487,445,490	1,576,692,219	
Total Assessed Value without UR		787,364,899	818,859,495	851,613,875	885,678,430	
AV without UR Less Frozen Base		528,206,209	559,700,805	592,455,185	626,519,740	
Taxing District:						
*Multnomah County (w/ Library levy)	4.9381	2,521,148	2,671,809	2,828,415	1,196,499	**32,762,291**
City of Portland	4.5770	2,336,789	2,476,432	2,621,587	1,109,004	**30,366,539**
Metro	0.0966	49,319	52,266	55,330	23,406	**640,902**
Port of Portland	0.0701	35,790	37,928	40,151	16,985	**465,085**
David Douglas Public School	4.6394	2,165,247	2,291,171	2,422,049	1,023,248	**28,230,362**
Parkrose Public School	4.8906	214,413	230,882	248,018	106,337	**2,688,255**
Mult Co. Educ. Service Dist.	0.4576	233,628	247,589	262,101	110,876	**3,035,990**
Mt. Hood Community College	0.2828	225,459	238,932	252,937	106,999	**2,929,837**