

# Memo



**Metro**

600 NE Grand Ave.  
Portland, OR 97232-2736

Date: October 4, 2017  
To: Martha Bennett, Chief Operating Officer  
From: Brian Newman, Chair, 2040 Planning and Development Grant Screening Committee  
Subject: Grant Award Recommendations

---

On behalf of the 2040 Planning and Development Grant Screening Committee, I am pleased to share our recommendations for the 2017 Grant awards. Metro received a total of 18 grant proposals submitted by nine local jurisdictions requesting a combined total of nearly \$3.7 million in funding. Proposals were submitted by both large and small jurisdictions across the region, with applicants distributed throughout all three counties.

A wide variety of eligible project types were represented among the grant applications. Some of the proposed projects would support planning activities leading to short-term strategies for formal development commitments and development agreements. Others would allow for policy review and refinement or strategic planning that will eventually set the stage for redevelopment. Two proposals addressed the formation and planning of urban renewal districts. A handful of proposals proposed outreach and visioning activities for specific neighborhoods. The applications included a proposal for county-wide infrastructure planning for urban reserve areas, and comprehensive planning for a new urban area, an action plan for permanent supportive housing and an industrial area redevelopment strategy.

With only \$2 million of funds available to award this year, it was assumed from the outset of the committee's work that the process would be highly competitive. However, after careful individual review of the applications by each committee member and a robust committee discussion of the relative merits of the proposals, the committee ultimately came to a unanimous decision regarding which proposals to recommend for grant funding, resulting in a recommendation totaling less than the \$2 million of funds available. Provided below is a brief overview of the committee's review process and deliberations, a listing of the applicants and proposals in each category which the committee recommends for funding, and additional comments and recommendations of committee members regarding the implementation of these specific grants and the 2040 Planning and Development Grant program overall.

## **Committee Process**

The nine members of the committee first convened in July to review the program guidelines, the established grant evaluation criteria, the grant requirements, and our committee's charter. Metro staff shared with the committee members the proposed policy and investment emphasis for the 2017 cycle as established by the Metro Council:

- 25% of grant funds targeted for qualified for concept planning and comprehensive planning projects in Urban Reserves or new urban areas.

## Addendum 1 to Exhibit A for Reso. 17-4846

GRANT AWARD RECOMMENDATIONS

SEPTEMBER 14, 2017

- 50% of funds targeted for qualified projects that will facilitate 'equitable development' projects within the urban growth boundary – either by having a strong emphasis on development that serves historically marginalized communities and/or by promoting development of equitable housing. Metro's working definition of equitable housing is diverse, quality, physically accessible, affordable housing choices with access to opportunities, services and amenities.
- 25% of funds targeted for qualified projects that facilitate infill development in centers, corridors, station areas, and employment areas within the urban growth boundary.
- In the event of insufficient qualified applications within any one funding category, grant funds may be awarded to qualified applications in any other category.

Staff reviewed the specific evaluation criteria (see Attachment A) to be utilized by committee members in ranking the applications. In addition, staff shared their overall assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the proposals in each funding category, and explained their reasoning for reassigning two proposals that were submitted in the 'Equitable Development' category to the 'infill development' category. All applicants were required to identify the funding category under which they wished their proposal to be considered. However, the applications submitted by the City of Tigard and by TriMet were reassigned because, in the opinion of Metro staff, equitable development was not the primary emphasis of the applications. Committee members concurred with staff's assessment and the resulting reassignment. In addition, the proposal submitted by King City did not respond to all required questions, and was therefore disqualified by staff, out of fairness to applicants who had correctly adhered to the stated requirements. The city will have the opportunity rework the proposal and resubmit in the 2018 grant cycle if desired.

Following the committee's initial meeting, members individually reviewed all of the eligible grant applications and assigned preliminary rankings within each category. When the committee reconvened in August to deliberate, members shared their reasoning for assigning specific ranks, the perceived strengths and weaknesses based on individual members' development expertise, as well as their understanding of the scope of work proposed.

The applications ultimately recommended by the committee were those that clearly aligned with the program's central mission to support planning and pre-development activities that:

- remove barriers to development
- are necessary to make land ready for development, and
- enable existing developed sites to be redeveloped.

Committee members applied their broad and deep collective expertise to consider which proposals had clear and achievable goals and would be most likely to facilitate impactful development outcomes in alignment with both local and regional goals.

## Addendum 1 to Exhibit A for Reso. 17-4846

GRANT AWARD RECOMMENDATIONS

SEPTEMBER 14, 2017

### Recommendations for Grant Awards

A listing of the committee’s funding recommendations for each target category is presented below. While committee members considered the option to recommend partial funding of proposals, we ultimately elected not to do so. Committee members felt that there was a clear distinction between the projects recommended for grant awards and those recommended for no funding. It should be noted that the committee deliberately decided not to award all of the available funding. Rather, we recommend that Metro utilize the remaining balance of funds (\$138,254) to provide additional technical assistance at the Council’s discretion for scope development and additional support to local staff and project managers who will be overseeing the grant work and supervising consultant teams. Especially for some of the more complex projects and for jurisdictions that have limited available staff resources, the additional expert assistance will help ensure that the proposed projects successfully achieve their stated goals.

Equitable Development (≈\$1 million targeted, \$859,000 recommended)

<b>City of Cornelius</b>	\$ 315,000
Cornelius Urban Renewal Plan, Town Center Plan, and Conceptual Site Planning	
<b>Housing Authority of Clackamas County</b>	\$ 214,000
Hillside Master Plan for Housing Opportunity	
<b>Clackamas County - DTD</b>	\$ 180,000
Park Avenue Development and Design Standards	
<b>City of Portland/Multnomah County Joint Office of Homeless Services</b>	\$ 150,000
Tri-county Equitable Housing Strategy to Expand Permanent Supportive Housing for People Experiencing Chronic Homelessness	

Facilitate Infill Development within UGB (≈\$500,000 targeted, \$602,746 recommended)

<b>City of Beaverton</b>	\$ 150,000
Downtown Design and Development Readiness Project	
<b>City of Tigard</b>	\$ 340,246
Tigard Triangle Urban Renewal Implementation Project	
<b>City of Portland</b>	\$ 112,500
Rossi Farms Site Specific Development Plan	

New Urban Area Planning (≈\$500,000 targeted, \$400,000 recommended)

<b>City of Happy Valley</b>	\$ 400,000
Pleasant Valley/North Carver Comprehensive Plan	

---

<b>Total Grant Awards Recommended</b>	<b>\$1,861,746</b>
---------------------------------------	--------------------

## Addendum 1 to Exhibit A for Reso. 17-4846

GRANT AWARD RECOMMENDATIONS

SEPTEMBER 14, 2017

### Applications Not Recommended for Funding

#### Equitable Development

<b>Multnomah County</b> Vance-Yeon Master Plan	\$ 300,000
<b>City of Portland</b> Brentwood Darlington Complete Community Strategy	\$ 155,000
<b>City of Portland</b> Expanding Opportunities for Affordable Housing in Faith Communities	\$ 125,000
<b>City of Portland</b> Infill Housing without Displacement: Sustainable NE Portland Strategy	\$ 150,000
<b>City of Portland</b> Maximizing Equitable Housing Using Climate Resilience Strategies in Johnson Creek Floodplain	\$ 104,850
<b>City of Portland</b> St. Johns Community Stability Project	\$ 102,500
<b>Prosper Portland</b> Anti-Displacement Strategies and Tools for Community Led Development	\$ 250,000

#### Infill Development within UGB

<b>Tri-County Metropolitan Transportation District of Oregon</b> Greyhound Site Feasibility Study	\$ 94,960
--	-----------

#### New Urban Area Planning

<b>Washington County</b> Getting Ahead of the Curve: Proactive Planning for Urban Reserves in Washington County	\$ 420,000
--	------------

### Additional Considerations

Members of the committee offered the following additional comments and recommendations to regarding their impressions of this grant cycle and potential future adjustments to the grant program and requirements:

- While some applications had been carefully prepared, succinctly described the project purpose and scope, and identified achievable development outcomes, there were a number of applications that were insufficiently thorough, and/or did not directly align to the central mission of the program to facilitate development and redevelopment in alignment with regional goals.
- Additional review, consideration, and guidance is needed regarding the program's equity objectives and the approach for emphasizing equitable development. The desired clarity and emphasis on equity could be accomplished by revising the overall evaluation criteria to

## Addendum 1 to Exhibit A for Reso. 17-4846

GRANT AWARD RECOMMENDATIONS

SEPTEMBER 14, 2017

better address equity goals, or by providing clearer guidelines for applicants regarding the types of projects that could successfully merit for funding in the 'equitable development' target category.

If you so desire, I will be happy to join you in presenting the committee's recommendations to the Metro Council in October. On behalf of the members of our 2040 Planning and Development Grant Screening Committee, thank you for inviting us to participate in this process and assist Metro in funding projects across the region that advance local and regional development goals and implement our shared vision for the future.

cc: Elissa Gertler, Director of Planning and Development  
Megan Gibb, Land Use and Urban Development Manager  
Lisa Miles, 2040 Planning and Development Grants Program Manager

**ATTACHMENT A TO GRANT AWARD RECOMMENDATIONS: GRANT EVALUATION CRITERIA**

**Clear development outcomes.** Proposal presents a compelling project concept with specific, impactful outcomes to facilitate development. Performance measures are clearly articulated.

**Advances and complements regional goals and policies.** Proposed project will help to advance established regional development goals and outcomes expressed in the 2040 Growth Concept, the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan, and the following Six Desired Outcomes stated in the Regional Framework Plan, adopted by the region to guide future planning:

- People live and work in vibrant communities where their everyday needs are easily accessible;
- Current and future residents benefit from the region's sustained economic competitiveness and prosperity;
- People have safe and reliable transportation choices that enhance their quality of life;
- The region is a leader in minimizing contributions to climate change;
- Current and future generations enjoy clean air, clean water and healthy ecosystems;
- The benefits and burdens of growth and change are distributed equitably.

**Aligns with local goals and/or maximizes community assets.** Proposed project will help realize community plans and goals, accommodate expected population and employment growth, and/or maximize existing community assets such as public transit, parks, natural features, historic districts and employment areas.

**Likelihood of implementation.** Relevant key stakeholders (property owners, policy makers, jurisdictions, service providers, etc.) have committed full support for the project goals and timelines, will be meaningfully involved in guiding the project, and have the capacity and authority to implement actions/investments as needed to bring the project to fruition. Opportunities and threats to project commitments are identified.

**Public involvement.** Proposal incorporates best practices for public involvement with clearly articulated and well-conceived strategies for strategies for meaningfully engaging neighbors, businesses, property owners and key stakeholders including historically marginalized communities and residents with lower incomes; proposal indicates how public input will be used to strengthen the project outcomes, and/or increase the likelihood of successful implementation.

**Team roles and capacity.** Roles and responsibilities of the applicant county or city, as well as any additional partners have been clearly defined; proposed staff has skill sets, experience and appropriate available time needed to successfully manage all aspects of the grant project and oversee the work of the consultant team or teams on behalf of the project partners.

## Addendum 1 to Exhibit A for Reso. 17-4846

GRANT AWARD RECOMMENDATIONS

SEPTEMBER 14, 2017

**Jurisdiction track record.** Applicant has proven capability to successfully implement community development projects, especially past CPDG or 2040 Grant projects; prior grants have fully delivered expected products and outcomes according to the approved schedule of milestones; any CPDG Grant projects still underway are on track and/or scheduled for completion prior to initiation of proposed project.

**Grant leverage.** Extent to which partners have committed additional in-kind or direct financial contributions to the project beyond the minimum ten percent match that is required.

**Replicable best practices.** Proposed project will develop best practices that could be replicated in other locations. (Note: This criterion may not be applied to all projects.)