

COLUMBIA GATEWAY URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY BOARD

March 17, 2026

5:30 p.m.

City Hall Council Chambers  
313 Court Street, The Dalles, Oregon

Via Zoom<https://us06web.zoom.us/j/86259459367?pwd=Z0Nnd3E4bkxBUVhXQkRKTKJCdEJ6QT09>Meeting ID: **862 5945 9367** Passcode: **292293**

Dial: 1-669-900-6833 or 1-253-215-8782

Upon request, the City will make a good faith effort to provide an interpreter for the deaf or hard of hearing at regular meetings if given 48 hours' notice. To make a request, please contact the City Clerk and provide your full name, sign language preference, and any other relevant information.

Contact the City Clerk at (541) 296-5481 ext. 1119, or [amell@ci.the-dalles.or.us](mailto:amell@ci.the-dalles.or.us).

1. CALL TO ORDER
2. ROLL CALL
3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – February 17, 2026
6. PRESENTATION:
  - A. University of Oregon Sustainable City Year Program – Downtown Market Analysis & Retail Mix Strategy
7. PUBLIC COMMENT – During this portion of the meeting, anyone may speak on any urban renewal subject. Five minutes per person will be allowed.
8. WORKSHOP:
  - A. Urban Renewal Ideas Matrix
9. BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS / QUESTIONS
10. STAFF COMMENTS / PROJECT UPDATES

11. ADJOURNMENT

---

Meeting conducted in a room in compliance with ADA standards.

Prepared by/  
Crystal Sayre, Administrative Assistant  
Community Development Department

---

**MINUTES**

**COLUMBIA GATEWAY URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY BOARD MEETING**

February 17, 2026

5:30 p.m.

City Hall Council Chambers  
313 Court Street, The Dalles, Oregon 97058  
Via Zoom / Livestream via City Website

- PRESIDING:** Dan Richardson, Chair
- BOARD PRESENT:** Jill Amery, Walter Denstedt, Scott Hege, Kristen Lillvik, Timothy McGlothlin, Bets Stelzer, Marcus Swift, Ben Wring
- BOARD ABSENT:** None.
- STAFF PRESENT:** Urban Renewal Agency Manager and Economic Development Officer (EDO) Jacob Anderson, Community Development Director (Director) Joshua Chandler, City Attorney Jonathan Kara, Community Development Analyst Ann Moorhead, Administrative Assistant Crystal Sayre

**CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order by Chair Richardson at 5:30 p.m.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Board Member Wring led the Pledge of Allegiance.

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

It was moved by Wring and seconded by Amery to approve the agenda as prepared. The motion carried 9/0; Amery, Denstedt, Hege, Lillvik, McGlothlin, Richardson, Stelzer, Swift, and Wring voted in favor, none opposed.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

It was moved by Amery and seconded by Wring to approve the minutes of January 20, 2026, as submitted. The motion carried 6/0/3, Amery, Lillvik, McGlothlin, Richardson, Swift, and Wring voted in favor; Denstedt, Hege and Stelzer abstained due to absence at the prior meeting.

**PRESENTATIONS**

A. University of Oregon Sustainable City Year Program

Community Development Director Joshua Chandler introduced Megan Banks, Director of the University of Oregon Sustainable City Year Program (SCYP), along with Community Development Analyst Ann Moorhead. Director Chandler explained that Staff have been

exploring opportunities to leverage university partnerships to help advance existing City and Urban Renewal initiatives that currently exceed available staff capacity.

Ms. Banks provided an overview of SCYP, describing it as a year-long partnership model connecting university coursework with real municipal projects. Through existing academic classes, students complete applied research and planning work addressing community needs while gaining professional experience.

She noted that since 2014 the program has completed more than 300 projects across Oregon communities of varying size and geography. Participating cities would identify priority projects aligned with adopted goals, after which faculty and students are matched to those projects.

Examples shared included:

- Downtown revitalization and tourism branding strategies;
- Transportation and active mobility planning;
- Economic development and market analysis studies;
- Community identity and marketing initiatives.

Ms. Banks emphasized that the program expands municipal capacity by allowing multiple academic disciplines to work simultaneously on City priorities, often producing work products that would otherwise require consultant contracts.

Director Chandler outlined Staff's preliminary work plan consisting of approximately fifteen potential projects tied directly to ongoing City initiatives, including:

- Housing Production Strategy implementation;
- Downtown market and retail analysis;
- Historic preservation ordinance and design standard updates;
- Economic development programming;
- Urban Renewal revitalization goals.

Estimated program costs total approximately \$195,000, with a proposed Urban Renewal Agency participation of up to \$65,000. Staff are pursuing State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) grant funding to further offset costs.

Board Member Wring requested clarification regarding examples of projects anticipated under the program and how they would relate specifically to Urban Renewal activities.

Board Member Hege asked detailed questions regarding program costs, funding structure, and how expenditures compared to hiring staff or participating in other internship programs. He expressed concern about ensuring Urban Renewal funds remain focused on district-related outcomes rather than broader City initiatives.

Board Member Amery stated she supported university partnerships but indicated she would prefer reviewing a more defined project list to confirm consistency with Urban Renewal Plan requirements and statutory limitations before committing funding.

Chair Richardson summarized Board interest in additional information and indicated the topic would return for further discussion following refinement of potential projects.

**B. Shayna Newsome – Downtown Care Team**

EDO Anderson introduced Shayna Newsome, owner of Various Artists LLC, explaining that the proposed Exterior Refresh Pilot evolved from internal discussions regarding strategies to reduce visible building deterioration downtown and encourage property owner reinvestment.

After consultation with the City Attorney regarding liability considerations, City staff developed a pilot incentive model allowing property owners to voluntarily participate while maintaining flexibility in contractor selection.

Ms. Newsome presented her professional background in production design, restoration work, and façade rehabilitation. She described observing numerous downtown buildings experiencing deferred maintenance, including peeling paint, water intrusion, and minor structural deterioration that could lead to larger repair costs if left unaddressed.

Using the Canton Wok building as an example, she provided a condition assessment identifying:

- Cracking and delamination of façade materials;
- Water damage and substrate exposure;
- Structural deterioration at lower façade elements;
- General cosmetic decline affecting streetscape appearance.

She proposed phased work including cleaning, repair, waterproofing, priming, and repainting, emphasizing preventative maintenance and cost efficiency. Ms. Newsome noted she would offer discounted labor rates and focus on smaller repair projects often overlooked by traditional contractors.

EDO Anderson explained that the Exterior Refresh Pilot program is intended to function as a gateway incentive, encouraging property owners to begin improvements that could later transition into larger Urban Renewal Incentive Program projects.

Chair Richardson thanked Ms. Newsome for bringing forward the proposal and asked clarifying questions regarding how the program would function in practice and how property owners would participate.

Board Member Wring confirmed that participation would not require use of a specific contractor and that property owners could select any licensed provider when utilizing Urban Renewal funding.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

**Cody Cornett, 1509 East 13<sup>th</sup> Street**

Mr. Cornett introduced the newly established Park Foundation of The Dalles, a 501(c)(3) formed to raise public funds for parks and recreational improvements.

He discussed the Mill Creek Greenway project, noting cost increases since original grant awards and suggesting Urban Renewal consider additional funding to close the gap. He described the Greenway as a potential “bookend” to downtown improvements and expressed the Foundation’s interest in partnering with the Agency on fundraising.

Board Members discussed ODOT funding status and acknowledged the proposal as informational.

## **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

### **A. Urban Renewal Ideas Matrix**

EDO Anderson presented a matrix compiling Board-submitted ideas for potential Urban Renewal investments. He noted projected available funding between \$4–7 million through Agency expiration, depending on final project costs.

He requested:

1. Additional Board-submitted ideas within one week.
2. Scheduling a workshop to refine and prioritize projects consistent with Urban Renewal goals.

Chair Richardson summarized Staff's request for additional project ideas and scheduling of a workshop to further evaluate potential Urban Renewal initiatives. Board Members indicated general agreement with submitting ideas and participating in a future workshop discussion.

### **B. Lewis and Clark Internship**

EDO Anderson reported that the City successfully secured two interns through the Lewis & Clark College internship program, describing the placements as high-value opportunities to advance economic development initiatives at minimal cost.

#### *Evan Stover – Downtown Market Analysis*

Mr. Evan Stover, a senior Economics student, presented his internship project focused on evaluating whether downtown The Dalles functions primarily as a “pass-through” community or as a destination.

He described conducting:

- Downtown business inventory analysis;
- Peer city comparisons with communities such as Hood River and Pendleton;
- Retail leakage and surplus evaluation;
- Identification of gaps in entertainment, retail diversity, and visitor-oriented uses.

Mr. Stover emphasized the importance of converting existing restaurant and visitor activity into longer stays by expanding complementary business types and experiences.

Board Member Stelzer commented that Mr. Stover's outside perspective provided valuable insight and compared the exercise to viewing a business through a first-time customer's experience.

Board Member Denstedt discussed the importance of identifying a defining attraction or theme capable of drawing visitors intentionally to The Dalles, noting examples such as recreation or cultural destinations in comparable communities.

Chair Richardson thanked Mr. Stover and encouraged continued collaboration with Staff and the Board as the project develops.

*Jazmin Contreras – Latino-Owned Business Strategy*

Ms. Jazmin Contreras, a senior Economics and Data Science student and Columbia Gorge native, introduced her internship project focused on developing a Latino-Owned Business Strategy for the City of The Dalles.

Ms. Contreras explained that the project emerged from discussions with Staff identifying an opportunity to better support Latino entrepreneurs and expand inclusive economic development efforts. She noted demographic and workforce trends within the region indicate growing Latino participation in the local economy, creating an opportunity for targeted business development strategies.

Her work will combine economic analysis, data research, and community engagement to better understand barriers and opportunities for Latino business ownership. Anticipated project components include:

- Identifying existing Latino-owned businesses and economic sectors represented locally;
- Evaluating access to business resources, financing, and technical assistance;
- Assessing challenges such as language access, permitting navigation, and outreach gaps;
- Reviewing successful programs from comparable communities;
- Developing policy and program recommendations to encourage entrepreneurship, business retention, and long-term economic participation.

Ms. Contreras noted that the project will also inform broader City economic development initiatives, including marketing and recruitment strategies connected to the Columbia Gorge Regional Airport business park.

EDO Anderson stated that the internship represents an opportunity to better align economic development programs with the full diversity of the regional workforce while generating data-driven recommendations for future City initiatives.

Board Member Swift recommended that Ms. Contreras connect with Blanca Flores, noting she previously organized a grassroots Latina small business roundtable that had generated strong participation and ideas within the community.

Board Member Wring encouraged examining historical trends of Latino-owned businesses within the Urban Renewal District, including businesses that had operated downtown but later closed. He suggested comparing longevity, challenges, and reasons for closure with broader downtown business patterns to better understand barriers to sustained business success and downtown longevity.

Chair Richardson thanked Ms. Contreras for her presentation and invited continued collaboration as the project progresses.

**ACTION ITEMS**

- A. Second Amendment to the Incentive Program Grant Agreement with TD3rd, LLC for the Basalt Commons project (523 East 3<sup>rd</sup> Street)

Economic Development Officer Anderson presented a request to approve a Second Amendment to the Incentive Program Grant Agreement and Development Funding Agreement

with TD3rd, LLC for the Basalt Commons project. Anderson explained the amendment would extend agreement expiration dates by six months to allow completion of remaining financing, intergovernmental coordination, and construction readiness steps.

Anderson reported the project continues to demonstrate forward progress. He noted confirmation had been received from BOLI (Bureau of Labor and Industries) indicating the project would not trigger prevailing wage requirements, eliminating a major uncertainty affecting project feasibility. Remaining milestones include final financing approval, confirmation of construction costs, County consideration of a proposed property acquisition arrangement, and completion of permitting steps necessary to begin construction.

Staff recommended approval of the extension, stating the Agency has historically supported the project and that the extension would allow a final determination of project viability within the requested timeframe. Anderson explained the Agency's primary consideration is the opportunity cost of holding funds rather than additional financial exposure.

Mary Hanlon, Hanlon Development / TD3rd, LLC, thanked the Board for considering the extension request. She reported the development team recently received positive updates and continues working through remaining barriers, many of which are outside the developer's direct control. Hanlon stated the project team remains committed to moving forward and anticipates breaking ground if financing and partner approvals proceed as expected, noting the six-month timeline is ambitious but achievable.

Chuck Gomez, owner of the Granada Theater, 221 East 2<sup>nd</sup> Street, testified on behalf of himself and neighborhood residents living near the project site. Mr. Gomez stated that while he recognizes the City and Agency have invested considerable effort into the Basalt Commons project, members of the surrounding neighborhood remain concerned about continued extensions of Urban Renewal funding commitments.

Mr. Gomez also expressed ongoing concerns regarding the Basalt Commons building design, including building height, potential obstruction of Columbia River views from nearby residences, and perceived impacts to the downtown Historic District. He stated neighborhood residents believe repeated extensions signal insufficient project progress and encouraged the Board to consider whether additional time should be granted without clearer evidence of construction commencement.

Mr. Gomez further questioned the level of financial commitment demonstrated by project partners, suggesting the Board evaluate whether sufficient "skin in the game" exists before extending Agency support. He stated he was speaking on behalf of multiple residents who submitted a signed letter included in the meeting packet.

Chair Richardson thanked Mr. Gomez for his testimony and closed public comment.

Board Member McGlothlin requested clarification regarding project progress since the previous meeting and asked Staff to outline remaining milestones necessary to confirm viability. He inquired whether the City continues to experience a housing deficit and asked whether approval of the extension would create additional financial risk for the Agency. McGlothlin also asked whether the developer had failed to meet obligations or whether alternative developers were positioned to advance housing projects.

EDO Anderson responded that Staff continue to observe forward movement and emphasized that remaining steps largely depend on external timelines such as lender review and partner

decisions. He stated the Agency's risk relates primarily to opportunity cost rather than additional expenditure and reiterated that the project addresses identified community housing needs.

Board Member Denstedt requested clarification regarding the County's role and whether bank financing depended on County action. Anderson explained he could not speak on behalf of the County but identified the County decision as one of the remaining key milestones while noting the City and Agency had completed actions within their authority.

Board Member Amery asked why Staff requested a six-month extension when several milestones were expected within three months. Anderson explained the additional time allows construction initiation and fulfillment of agreement payment conditions, avoiding the need for another administrative extension.

Board Member Stelzer asked whether Staff anticipated further delays beyond the requested timeframe. Anderson stated the project is approaching a "go or no-go" stage and indicated recent regulatory and entitlement progress suggests feasibility should be determined within the extension period.

Board Member Hege clarified the County's potential involvement, explaining the County is considering a property acquisition and leaseback arrangement rather than providing grant funding. He stated County action had been delayed pending regulatory confirmation and anticipated consideration in the near future.

City Attorney Kara confirmed that Board Member Hege had no conflict requiring recusal following disclosure of the County's potential involvement.

Anderson added that while the Agency's total investment is significant, the per-unit Urban Renewal contribution compares favorably to other housing incentive programs and represents an efficient investment in downtown housing production.

It was moved by Hege and seconded by Swift to authorize the Agency Manager to enter into the Second Amendment to the Incentive Program Grant Agreement with TD3rd, LLC for the Basalt Commons project. The motion carried 8/1; Amery, Hege, Lillvik, McGlothlin, Richardson, Stelzer, Swift, and Wring voted in favor, Denstedt opposed.

**B. Resolution 26-001 Exterior Refresh Pilot**

EDO Anderson presented *Resolution 26-001, A Resolution Establishing an Exterior Refresh Pilot as a Component of the Urban Renewal Incentive Program*. Anderson explained the program was developed in response to prior Board discussions regarding incremental "small wins" in downtown revitalization and opportunities to encourage visible improvements with minimal administrative burden.

The proposed pilot would allocate up to \$100,000 in Agency funds, providing reimbursement of up to \$7,500 per property for eligible exterior refresh activities. Anderson emphasized the program is intended to function similarly to the Incentive Program but with simplified requirements, no lien component, and reimbursement issued upon completion of approved work. He stated the program is designed to create visible improvements that demonstrate Urban Renewal investment while encouraging broader participation in downtown revitalization efforts.

Chair Richardson confirmed the \$100,000 allocation represents a small portion of the Agency's available funds and would not significantly impact overall budgeting capacity.

Anderson affirmed that property owners would remain responsible for selecting contractors and managing projects and that the Agency would not engage in contractor selection.

---

Board Member Lillvik confirmed the program operates as a reimbursement model rather than an advance payment system. Anderson affirmed that reimbursement would occur only after eligible work is completed and documented.

Board Member Hege requested clarification regarding projected Agency funding over the remaining life of the Urban Renewal District. Anderson explained the distinction between current budgeted funds and projected revenue through Agency sunset, noting that the \$100,000 allocation is de minimis relative to long-term projected capacity.

Board Member Stelzer asked how Staff intends to market the program to downtown business and property owners and noted that building ownership is often separate from business tenancy. She inquired whether the City maintains adequate contact information for property owners.

Anderson stated Staff intends to conduct direct outreach, leverage interns currently working on downtown business inventories, and distribute informational materials broadly. He noted parcel records provide ownership information and stated Staff would develop marketing materials to support outreach efforts.

Board Member Amery offered to assist with identifying property owners and contacts.

Board Member Denstedt noted that County records identify building ownership information.

Board Member McGlothlin suggested technology tools may assist in locating ownership and contact information.

Chair Richardson indicated support for creating a one-page informational flyer for Board Members to distribute during community interactions.

It was moved by Hege and seconded by Denstedt to approve “Resolution 26-001, A Resolution Establishing an Exterior Refresh Pilot as a Component of the Urban Renewal Incentive Program”, as prepared. The motion carried 9/0; Amery, Denstedt, Hege, Lillvik, McGlothlin, Richardson, Stelzer, Swift, and Wring voted in favor, none opposed.

C. Resolution 26-002 Updating the Agency’s Local Contract Review Board Rules

City Attorney Jonathan Kara presented *Resolution 26-002, A Resolution Updating the Columbia Gateway Urban Renewal Agency Local Contract Review Board Rules (Effective February 18, 2026) and Establishing a New Fee*. Kara explained that the Agency is required under Oregon law to maintain contracting rules governing procurement of goods, services, and public improvements.

He stated the proposed update modernizes the Agency’s rules to align with recent changes in Oregon public contracting thresholds and mirrors revisions adopted by the City Council. Kara explained that inflation and statutory updates have increased allowable informal contracting thresholds, and the proposed amendments reflect those state-authorized adjustments.

Kara emphasized the resolution does not alter the Agency Manager’s existing requirement to obtain Board approval for procurements exceeding \$100,000 and does not change spending authority for grant programs. Rather, it increases flexibility for smaller procurements and aligns the Agency with prevailing statewide standards.

Chair Richardson characterized the item as primarily a housekeeping and modernization measure and invited questions from the Board.

Board Members asked no substantive policy questions and indicated general understanding of

the updates as administrative in nature.

It was moved by Swift and seconded by McGlothlin to approve “Resolution 26-002, A Resolution Updating the Columbia Gateway Urban Renewal Agency Local Contract Review Board Rules (Effective February 18, 2026) and Establishing a New Fee”, as prepared. The motion carried 9/0; Amery, Denstedt, Hege, Lillvik, McGlothlin, Richardson, Stelzer, Swift, and Wring voted in favor, none opposed.

**BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS / QUESTIONS**

Board Member Hege asked about scheduling a workshop to review the Urban Renewal Ideas Matrix. Chair Richardson suggested holding the discussion during the next regular Urban Renewal Board meeting.

Chair Richardson expressed appreciation for Board Members’ service and engagement in Agency matters.

EDO Anderson reminded Board Members to submit additional matrix ideas within one week.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:59 p.m.

---

*Meeting conducted in a room in compliance with ADA standards.*

Submitted by/  
Crystal Sayre, Administrative Assistant  
Community Development Department

SIGNED: \_\_\_\_\_  
Dan Richardson, Chair

ATTEST: \_\_\_\_\_  
Crystal Sayre, Administrative Assistant  
Community Development Department



## **AGENDA STAFF REPORT**

### **AGENDA LOCATION: 8. A.**

**MEETING DATE:** March 17, 2026

**TO:** Chair and Members of the Urban Renewal Agency Board

**FROM:** Jacob Anderson  
Agency Manager

**ISSUE:** Urban Renewal Strategy Workshop, Goals, Investment Focus, and Priority Work Program

### **BACKGROUND**

Staff compiled an inventory of 51 ideas based on Board input and staff work. To make the inventory usable, staff organized the ideas into three lists: private capital help, public space improvements, and policy and operations. The workshop is intended to confirm near term goals for the Agency, clarify how the Agency should focus its investments, and narrow the inventory to a manageable set of priorities that aligns with the Urban Renewal Plan and available staff capacity. This is a workshop item intended to provide direction rather than take formal action on specific projects.

The Agency has received a wide range of ideas about how Urban Renewal can support downtown revitalization and district investment. Several themes recur across Board input:

1. Building reinvestment and upper story activation, including life safety, roofs, and conversion feasibility
2. Public realm and infrastructure improvements that affect downtown experience, access, and redevelopment readiness
3. The need to focus on actions appropriate for Urban Renewal, avoid duplication with other organizations, and be realistic about what staff can deliver

To support a productive discussion, staff separated the inventory into three standalone matrices:

1. Private capital help matrix
2. Public space improvements matrix
3. Policy and operations matrix

## Inventory snapshot

Total ideas: 51

1. Private capital help  
19 ideas, 37.3 percent  
These ideas primarily support private reinvestment through tools such as rehabilitation loans and grants, code and life safety upgrades, upper story conversions, and targeted predevelopment or technical assistance.
2. Public space improvements 16  
ideas, 31.4 percent  
These ideas primarily support public realm and infrastructure investments such as sidewalks, alleys, connectivity, plazas, wayfinding, parking concepts, and other improvements that change downtown function and experience.
3. Policy and operations 16  
ideas, 31.4 percent  
These ideas primarily improve how the Agency operates, designs programs, coordinates, and removes barriers. Some items may require City Council action rather than Urban Renewal investment.

## Urban Renewal fit

Some ideas are clearly consistent with common Urban Renewal tools focused on redevelopment, building reinvestment, and public improvements that support private reinvestment. Other ideas are better suited for City policy action or partner led business support. The workshop should focus on what Urban Renewal can directly fund and implement under the adopted Urban Renewal Plan, or what may require a minor plan amendment for clarity.

## Staff capacity and delivery pace

The inventory includes concepts that range from quick, low lift actions to multi year efforts requiring significant staff time and external coordination. Narrowing the list will help ensure the Agency can deliver visible outcomes and maintain momentum.

## Tenant improvement scope

Some ideas involve supporting tenants. If the Agency wishes to consider tenant improvements, staff recommends limiting that tool to permanent physical improvements tied to occupancy outcomes, structured as reimbursement after completion with clear performance terms, rather than operating subsidies.

## **DISCUSSION**

1. Primary goal for the next 12 to 18 Months
  - A. Increase downtown occupancy and reinvestment in existing buildings
  - B. Deliver public realm improvements that change the downtown experience and redevelopment readiness
  - C. Unlock one or two catalytic redevelopment opportunities that change the trajectory of the district
  - D. Other, Board specified

2. Secondary Goal for the next 12 to 18 Months
  - A. Upper story conversion outcomes
  - B. Business retention through physical buildout and code upgrades
  - C. Connectivity, access, and parking readiness
  - D. Other, Board specified
3. Desired Balance of Agency Investments
  - A. Balanced approach between private capital help and public space improvements
  - B. Private capital first approach, emphasizing building reinvestment tools
  - C. Public realm first approach, emphasizing public space improvements
  - D. Other, Board specified
4. Tenant improvement scope
 

If the Agency includes a tenant improvement tool, should it be limited to permanent physical buildout tied to occupancy outcomes, reimbursed after completion, with performance terms

  - A. Yes, limited to physical improvements only
  - B. No, do not include tenant improvements as an Agency tool
  - C. Other, Board specified
5. Narrowing decision, selection of priorities
 

From each category, which 2 to 3 items should be the Agency priorities for the next 12 to 18 months:

  - A. Private capital help, select 2 to 3
  - B. Public space improvements, select 2 to 3
  - C. Policy and operations, select 2 to 3
6. Items to Remove
  - A. Which items should be removed because they are not appropriate for Urban Renewal action, are primarily a City responsibility, or duplicate existing partner roles

### **Follow up based on direction**

Following the workshop, staff will update the matrices to reflect Board direction, remove out of scope items, and prepare a concise implementation list for the next meeting packet

### **BUDGET IMPLICATIONS**

No direct fiscal impact is requested with this workshop item. Any future program or project recommendations resulting from Board direction will return with estimated cost ranges and funding approach options.

### **Attachments**

- **Attachment A – Private Capital Help Matrix**
- **Attachment B – Public Space Improvements Matrix**
- **Attachment C – Policy and Operations Matrix**

ID	Section	Idea	Originator(s)	Type	Cost (L/M/H)	Plan Fit (Current/Minor)	Plan Fit Confidence	Time Horizon	Staff Effort (L/M/H)	Notes / Dependencies	Capital Readiness
1	Downtown buildings & upper story reuse	Upper story design charrette program to generate concepts, cost ranges, and permitting paths for priority buildings	Ben	Planning/ Predevelopment	Medium	Current Plan	Medium	Near (0 to 6 mo)	Medium	Likely eligible as planning/predevelopment; confirm UR plan supports planning studies and consultant services. Marcus notes outcomes improve if led by owners or developers who can bring capital and execute.	Unknown
2	Downtown buildings & upper story reuse	Upper story conversion fund using loans or grants paired with design help	Ben	Capital/ Loan Grant Program	High	Current Plan	Medium	Mid (6 to 18 mo)	Medium	IP Program & DFAs.	Unknown
3	Downtown buildings & upper story reuse	Expand Incentive Program eligibility to include roofs and fire suppression when tied to viable occupancy and downtown outcomes	Ben; Klebes	Capital/ Loan Grant Program	High	Minor Plan Amendment	Medium	Near (0 to 6 mo)	Low	Possible Changes to IP program to increase Roof support.	Unknown
4	Downtown buildings & upper story reuse	No interest loan program with forgiveness tiers: Round 1 ≤5,000 sf owner occupied; later rounds expand eligibility	Klebes	Capital/ Loan Grant Program	Medium	Minor Plan Amendment	Low	Near (0 to 6 mo)	Medium	Program design, legal docs, servicing, and compliance; plan fit depends on existing loan authority language.	Unknown
5	Downtown buildings & upper story reuse	Explore targeted reuse options for the former JC Penney (Discounts Plus) building	Dan	Site Redevelopment/ Acquisition	High	Current Plan	Low	Mid (6 to 18 mo)	High	Could involve acquisition, feasibility, or RFP; plan fit depends on project type and location within district. Scott supportive of exploring this building as a catalyst.	Unknown
6	Downtown buildings & upper story reuse	Reengage Sunshine Mill on downtown aligned reinvestment opportunities, including parking lot surfacing concept	Dan; Klebes	Capital/ Partnership	Medium	Current Plan	Low	Near (0 to 6 mo)	Medium	Possible UR support to private site improvements;	Unknown
7	Business retention, attraction & startup support	Business Action Team: structured listening + solutions group; deliver prioritized report to URA	Ben; Dan	Program/ Engagement	Low	Current Plan	High	Near (0 to 6 mo)	Low	Can be done as board/staff convening; minimal cost (facilitation, venue, food).	Unknown
8	Business retention, attraction & startup support	BRE program emphasis to inform URA tactical decisions and program design	Ben; Klebes	Program/ Strategy	Low	Current Plan	High	Near (0 to 6 mo)	Medium	Ongoing effort; could be staff led or contracted; aligns with economic development function.	Unknown

9	Business retention, attraction & startup support	Microgrant and small loan toolkit for retention and recruitment (rent help, inventory support, business services)	Ben; Klebes	Grant/ Loan Program	Medium	Minor Plan Amendment	Medium	Mid (6 to 18 mo)	Medium	Working capital (inventory, rent subsidies) is often harder under UR rules; may need plan language + legal review; consider focusing on tenant improvements instead. Marcus cautions working capital support is higher risk and short term. Consider partnering with banks or lenders and require clear viability tests.	Unknown
10	Business retention, attraction & startup support	Rent roll concept for tenant support or recruitment packaging	Klebes	Program/ Subsidy	Medium	Minor Plan Amendment	Medium	Near (0 to 6 mo)	Medium	Direct rent subsidies may be restricted; consider structuring as performance based grants tied to improvements/activation. Marcus cautions rent subsidies can be short term without addressing business fundamentals.	Unknown
11	Business retention, attraction & startup support	Pay SBDC fees or targeted SBDC services for local or new businesses for a defined period	Ben; Klebes	Partnership/ Technical Assistance	Low	Current Plan	Medium	Near (0 to 6 mo)	Low	Likely eligible as technical assistance if plan allows; verify procurement and equitable access.	Unknown
12	Business retention, attraction & startup support	Business advocate/concierge function to help businesses navigate city processes and connect to resources	Ben; Dan	Staffing/ Service	Medium	Current Plan	Medium	Near (0 to 6 mo)	High	Ongoing staffing cost; confirm admin expense caps and that scope fits UR objectives.	Unknown
13	Business retention, attraction & startup support	Innovation lab/incubator: low rent space or 1 year rent subsidy for qualified startups; mentorship led model	Dan; Klebes	Facility/ Program	High	Minor Plan Amendment	Medium	Mid (6 to 18 mo)	High	If URA leases/operates space or subsidizes rent, may need plan language; alternative is partner led with URA funding tenant improvements. Marcus cautions subsidy heavy models need clear long term outcomes and selection criteria.	Unknown
14	Business retention, attraction & startup support	Retail gap analysis to identify missing categories and recruitment targets	Ben	Planning/ Consulting	Low	Current Plan	High	Near (0 to 6 mo)	Low	Consultant study typically eligible as planning/ED service.	Unknown
15	Business retention, attraction & startup support	Startup pitch event and speaker series featuring downtown operators and successful renovators	Dan	Program/ Event	Low	Current Plan	Medium	Near (0 to 6 mo)	Medium	Event costs small; ensure alignment with UR objectives and avoid ongoing event dependency. Scott less supportive of pitch events. Suggest others lead.	Unknown
43	Business retention, attraction & startup support	Explore a regional agriculture innovation hub concept including value add processing opportunities and partnerships for sustainable practices	Marcus Swift	Program/ Strategy	High	Minor Plan Amendment	Low	Long (18 or more mo)	Medium	May be outside district. Clarify what component, if any, is district connected. Likely Port led with URA as a limited partner.	Unknown

47	Business retention, attraction & startup support	Create performance based incentives or expedited review benefits for projects that meet defined standards and outcomes	Marcus Swift	Grant/ Loan Program	Medium	Minor Plan Amendment	Medium	Mid (6 to 18 mo)	Medium	Define objective standards and guardrails. Align with existing incentive tools and ensure fair access.	Unknown
48	Business retention, attraction & startup support	Commission a district market study on rents, absorption, and vacancy to ground incentives and improve developer pro forma assumptions	Marcus Swift	Planning/ Consulting	Low	Current Plan	Medium	Near (0 to 6 mo)	Low	Useful input for upper story conversion work and site targeting. Can be updated periodically.	Unknown
50	Business retention, attraction & startup support	Provide technical assistance navigation and incentive stacking support to building owners and developers to improve feasibility	Marcus Swift	Partnership/ Technical Assistance	Low	Current Plan	Medium	Near (0 to 6 mo)	Medium	Could be delivered through a partner with URA funding support. Coordinate with business advocate concept to avoid duplication.	Unknown

ID	Section	Idea	Originator(s)	Type	Cost (L/M/H)	Plan Fit (Current/Minor)	Plan Fit Confidence	Time Horizon	Staff Effort (L/M/H)	Notes / Dependencies	Capital Readiness
16	Downtown activation, placemaking & aesthetics	Arts district along Fourth Street with branding, signage, public art, maker connections	Dan	Placemaking/ Capital	Medium	Current Plan	Medium	Mid (6 to 18 mo)	Medium	Wayfinding/public art/streetscape often eligible;	Unknown
17	Downtown activation, placemaking & aesthetics	Beautification incentives: flowers, trees, paint, storefront cleanup, alleys + funded watering plan	Bets; Dan	Placemaking/ Small Grants	Low	Current Plan	Medium	Near (0 to 6 mo)	Medium	Ongoing maintenance is the risk; consider one time capital items + partner maintenance agreements.	Unknown
18	Downtown activation, placemaking & aesthetics	Close 2nd Street for events concept	Klebes	Operations/ Activation	Low	Current Plan	Low	Near (0 to 6 mo)	Low	Mostly a city operations decision; URA may fund infrastructure, equipment, or traffic control plans if eligible.	Unknown
19	Downtown activation, placemaking & aesthetics	Food cart hub concept (Tony's lot as possible location)	Bets	Site Activation/ Capital	Medium	Current Plan	Low	Mid (6 to 18 mo)	High	Requires site control, utilities, code compliance; verify whether URA can fund site improvements.	Unknown
20	Downtown activation, placemaking & aesthetics	WWTP beautification concept	Klebes	Placemaking/ Capital	Low	Current Plan	Low	Mid (6 to 18 mo)	Low	small scale aesthetic work. Scott not supportive. Prefer this as a City investment.	Unknown
30	District sites, connectivity & infrastructure	Public infrastructure concept: 6th Street Bridge	Klebes	Public Infrastructure	High	Current Plan	Low	Long (18 or more mo)	High	Major capital project with design, permitting, and funding stack; Not currently in UR plan project list	Unknown
31	District sites, connectivity & infrastructure	Additional support for Federal Street Plaza	Klebes	Public Infrastructure/ Placemaking	Medium	Current Plan	Medium	Mid (6 to 18 mo)	Low	Confirm remaining needs and match sources.	Unknown
32	District sites, connectivity & infrastructure	Focus sites list for rest of district (Armory lot; 2nd & Webber; old recyclables shop; behind Hamilton & Tum A Lum)	Klebes	Site Strategy	Low	Current Plan	High	Near (0 to 6 mo)	Low	Inventory and prioritization; leads to feasibility/RFP work.	Unknown
33	District sites, connectivity & infrastructure	Improve connections within downtown and to neighborhoods (Union/Washington links; Mill Creek Greenway; alley strategy)	Klebes	Mobility/ Public Realm	High	Current Plan	Medium	Long (18 or more mo)	High	Likely multi phase capital work	Unknown

34	District sites, connectivity & infrastructure	Parking lot surfacing work; site team to map constraints and propose solutions	Klebes	Planning/ Policy	Low	Current Plan	Medium	Near (0 to 6 mo)	Medium	Mixture of staff time and consultant time; Unknown outputs should feed project pipeline.	Unknown
35	Recreation & waterfront amenities	Waterfront access concept: clean beach with sand and safe water access	Bets	Public Amenity/ Capital	High	Minor Plan Amendment	Low	Long (18 or more mo)	High	May be outside UR district; requires environmental and property constraints review.	Unknown
36	Recreation & waterfront amenities	Recreation attraction incentives: bowling, ice/roller rink, year round pool	Bets; Klebes	Facility/ Recruitment	High	Minor Plan Amendment	Low	Long (18 or more mo)	Medium	Large capital and operational complexity; if URA funds, plan language and district nexus likely needed.	Unknown
39	Downtown activation, placemaking & aesthetics	Create a music ecosystem policy and implementation plan focused on downtown venues, education, and year round programming using a stakeholder convening process	Marcus Swift	Planning/ Policy	Medium	Minor Plan Amendment	Low	Mid (6 to 18 mo)	High	Define district focus and governance. Address potential conflicts with upper story housing such as noise. Consider soundproofing expectations and clear venue standards.	Unknown
40	Downtown activation, placemaking & aesthetics	Pair local artists with vacant storefronts for temporary displays to improve street experience until spaces lease up	Marcus Swift	Operations/ Activation	Low	Current Plan	Medium	Near (0 to 6 mo)	Low	Requires building owner permission, simple agreements, installation guidelines, and basic liability planning. Can complement dark windows work.	Unknown
49	District sites, connectivity & infrastructure	Invest in shared amenities that reduce developer costs and increase district value such as parking, green space, and public realm improvements	Marcus Swift	Public Amenity/ Capital	High	Current Plan	Medium	Long (18 or more mo)	High	Best paired with target redevelopment sites and a clear implementation sequence. Coordinate with parking strategy work.	Unknown
51	District sites, connectivity & infrastructure	Develop a downtown parking strategy for future growth including Basalt Commons impacts, shared parking, management tools, and potential new capacity	Scott Hege	Mobility/ Public Realm	Medium	Current Plan	Medium	Mid (6 to 18 mo)	High	Start with utilization data and shared parking agreements. Coordinate with major projects and redevelopment sites.	Unknown

ID	Section	Idea	Originator(s)	Type	Cost (L/M/H)	Plan Fit (Current/Minor)	Plan Fit Confidence	Time Horizon	Staff Effort (L/M/H)	Notes / Dependencies	Capital Readiness
21	Standards, enforcement & barrier reduction	Streamline planning and permitting for downtown conversion/change of use/upper story projects	Ben	Process Improvement	Low	Current Plan	Medium	Near (0 to 6 mo)	Medium	Mostly staff time in Community Development; URA could fund a consultant/code audit if needed.	Unknown
22	Standards, enforcement & barrier reduction	Commercial property maintenance standards ordinance addressing chronic landlord neglect	Ben	Policy/Regulation	Low	Current Plan	Low	Mid (6 to 18 mo)	Medium	Not an URA capital investment; political/legal lift; may need city attorney; URA role likely indirect.	Unknown
23	Standards, enforcement & barrier reduction	Dark windows ordinance concept	Dan; Klebes	Policy/Regulation	Low	Current Plan	Low	Mid (6 to 18 mo)	Medium	Policy action; URA investment is indirect; coordinate with code enforcement and legal.	Unknown
24	Standards, enforcement & barrier reduction	Sidewalk repair incentive concept	Dan	Capital/Loan Grant Program	Medium	Current Plan	Medium	Mid (6 to 18 mo)	Medium	Eligible as streetscape/public infrastructure; confirm responsibility split city vs property owner. Review current City sidewalk program. Scott supportive of keeping sidewalks and related	Unknown
25	Organization, governance & learning	Formal board education on URA powers, limitations, eligible tools, and peer models	Ben	Governance/Capacity	Low	Current Plan	High	Near (0 to 6 mo)	Low	Could be workshops with legal counsel/consultants; inexpensive and high leverage.	Unknown
26	Organization, governance & learning	Study tour to peer communities (Pendleton, Hood River, another peer)	Ben	Learning/Benchmarking	Low	Current Plan	High	Near (0 to 6 mo)	Low	Travel costs modest yet not in budget; pair with a deliverable to justify.	Unknown
27	Organization, governance & learning	Downtown stakeholder brainstorming session: business owner heavy, structured, dot voting	Dan; Klebes	Engagement	Low	Current Plan	High	Near (0 to 6 mo)	Low	Facilitation can be in house or contracted; quick win.	Unknown
28	Organization, governance & learning	Main Street revitalization options including bringing function in house with paid leadership and clear goals	Ben; Dan	Org/Staffing	Medium	Current Plan	Medium	Mid (6 to 18 mo)	High	Ongoing operations/staffing may exceed typical URA admin; Likely City Project. needs governance clarity and funding plan.	Unknown
29	Organization, governance & learning	Avoid duplication with SBDC, Port, MCEDD when designing new programs	Klebes	Strategy/Coordination	Low	Current Plan	High	Near (0 to 6 mo)	Low	Operating principle rather than stand alone project. Scott supports avoiding duplication and focusing URA on gaps only.	Unknown

37	Targets & measurement	Define outcome metrics first; invite project proposals that advance those metrics	Klebes	Governance/Performance Mgmt	Low	Current Plan	High	Near (0 to 6 mo)	Low	Fast to implement; supports prioritization and accountability.	Unknown
38	Targets & measurement	Example target: 80% of total retail square footage downtown occupied; focus retail/experience businesses on 2nd Street	Klebes	Strategy/Targeting	Low	Current Plan	Medium	Near (0 to 6 mo)	Low	Needs baseline measurement approach and data ownership (leases/vacancy tracking).	Unknown
41	Organization, governance & learning	Develop a coordinated brand identity toolkit for The Dalles and downtown that partners can use consistently	Marcus Swift	Program/Strategy	Medium	Minor Plan Amendment	Low	Mid (6 to 18 mo)	Medium	To fit URA, keep scope tied to district economic outcomes and business recruitment. Clarify lead partner and long term stewardship.	Unknown
42	Organization, governance & learning	Form a coordinated business community coalition among key organizations to improve communication, align calendars, and reduce fragmentation	Marcus Swift	Strategy/Coordination	Low	Current Plan	Low	Near (0 to 6 mo)	Medium	Define a simple governance model and clear deliverables. Focus on filling gaps rather than taking over existing missions.	Unknown
44	Targets & measurement	Add a capital readiness metric to the matrix scoring based on private capital committed or accessible	Marcus Swift	Governance/Performance Mgmt	Low	Current Plan	High	Near (0 to 6 mo)	Low	Use a simple scale and require evidence for Medium or High ratings. Helps avoid prioritizing concepts with no path to execution.	Unknown
45	Standards, enforcement & barrier reduction	Modernize zoning and design guidance for the district to improve predictability and support mixed use outcomes	Marcus Swift	Policy/Regulation	Medium	Minor Plan Amendment	Low	Long (18 or more mo)	High	City led code work. If URA participates, keep scope limited to the district and tie to measurable permit and housing outcomes.	Unknown
46	Standards, enforcement & barrier reduction	Set measurable benchmarks for permitting timelines and publish clear checklists and review steps to improve predictability	Marcus Swift	Process Improvement	Low	Current Plan	Low	Near (0 to 6 mo)	Medium	Start by measuring current timelines. Set targets and report quarterly. Include a developer facing checklist.	Unknown