

Findings and Observations Regarding the 2024 Urban Renewal District Supporting Report and Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes

Prepared by: Jef Walls, Urban Renewal District Advisory Committee (for placement in the public record)

Date: 01/08/2026

SECTION ONE: Findings

I. Statement of Capacity and Purpose

I submit this document as a member of the Urban Renewal District Advisory Committee to preserve the public record regarding the materials and meeting record on which the committee was asked to rely. The committee's role presumes a stable planning framework and a reliable record of deliberations. Over the course of my service, these conditions were not present.

II. The Evidentiary Shift (2007 vs. 2024)

The 2007 Supporting Report functioned as a complete evidentiary document for purposes of advisory committee review under ORS 457. The 2024 "Blue Book" represents the most extensive alteration of evidentiary findings and supporting analysis since the district's creation. This transition reflects the removal of specific evidentiary findings previously attributed to professional consultants.

Burden of Proof: By replacing consultant-verified data with generalized policy language, the "Blue Book" shifts the burden of proof from third-party experts to City staff.

Statutory Gaps: The 2024 report removed the Analysis of Alternatives and Relocation Planning, and replaced parcel-specific findings with generalized "opportunity" framing.

Lack of Finality: While the report presents itself as a finalized 2024 document, the committee record reflects ongoing uncertainty and discussion regarding document versions well into 2025.

III. Procedural Gaps in the Committee Record

There is no clear record demonstrating that the Supporting Report was presented to the committee as a finalized, settled evidentiary document at the time deliberations occurred. Minutes from 2025 were delayed, incomplete, or tabled. They reflect that committee discussions focused on framework rather than reliance on a stable Supporting Report.

Review of the meeting record indicates that a discussion originating during the March 27, 2025 meeting does not appear in the March minutes as recorded, but instead appears for the first time in the April 30, 2025 minutes, altering the chronological integrity of the committee record.

Missing Records: A formal inquiry regarding the availability of minutes was submitted in late 2025, but no response was received. As of this filing, no minutes for the September 25, 2025 meeting exist, creating a gap regarding the committee’s discussions.

SECTION TWO: Impact on Advisory Function

The transition from the 2007 to the 2024 report reflects material changes to structure and content that materially affect how qualifying conditions are demonstrated. Because the record remains unsettled—with key minutes tabled or unproduced—the committee has been asked to assess consistency with adopted plans and formulate recommendations in the absence of a stable evidentiary record. Continued reliance on the 2024 Supporting Report creates uncertainty that undermines the committee's responsibilities and exposes future actions to avoidable risks.

The committee’s meeting minutes themselves contain material inaccuracies, omissions, and post-hoc editorial framing, preventing them from serving as a reliable account of deliberations. Because these deficiencies concern record continuity rather than isolated errors, they cannot be resolved solely through post hoc corrections. Deficiencies are documented in the exhibits below.

SECTION THREE: Evidence Exhibits

Exhibit A - Urban Renewal Supporting Report — Comparative Index (2007 vs. 2024)

Topic	2007	2024	Observed Difference
Conditions Analysis	Detailed, parcel-specific	Generalized, programmatic	Removal of parcel-specific evidentiary findings
Analysis of Alternatives Included		Removed	Statutory component absent
Relocation Planning	Included	Removed	Statutory component absent
Taxing District Impacts	Detailed calculations	Summarized	Underlying data not presented
Citizen-Oriented Framing	Embedded evidentiary narrative	Procedural references only	Accountability posture shifted
Geographic Specificity	Explicit, mapped findings	Broad “opportunity” framing	Reduced geographic grounding
Condition → Project Linkage	Directly established	Policy-driven goals	Projects framed as objectives rather than remedies

Exhibit B - Consolidated Audit of Meeting Records

The following identify systemic issues with the March 27 and April 30 meeting minutes that prevent them from serving as a reliable public record:

Decisions Without Procedural Steps: The March 27 minutes state that project priorities were "decided," yet they fail to document any corresponding motion, second, or vote.

Procedural Status of Availability of Minutes: The March 27 minutes were tabled for 'internal review' and were later approved in materially altered form. The April minutes were not approved and the committee was not provided these minutes for several critical months.

Relocation of Discussion Across Meetings: A material statement made during the March 27 meeting does not appear in the March minutes but instead appears in the April 30 minutes, a reallocation of discussion that is only apparent through side-by-side review.

Post-Meeting Editorial Terminology: The April 30 draft minutes use descriptors like "Blue Book" and "Red Book" that were not established on the record during the actual discussion, reflecting post-meeting editorial framing rather than a sequential account.

Omission of Subject-Matter Scope: Substantial discussions regarding trail feasibility and alignment initiated by the chair and staff were omitted and replaced with narrowed summaries focused on document terminology.

Omission of Property Acquisition Discussion: Substantial discussion regarding the Willis property and associated line of credit was omitted from the record.

Lack of Evidence Indexing: The minutes provide no index to identify which specific documents governed the committee's deliberations.

Exhibit C - Condensed Chronology of Supporting Report Transition (2025)

March 27 — Priorities Set Without a Foundation: The Committee met for the first time in 2025. Minutes reflect that project priorities were "decided," yet no governing Supporting Report (the "Blue Book") had been physically presented to the committee at this time.

April 30 — Introduction of the "Blue Book": This was the first meeting where the revised Supporting Report was physically provided. During this meeting, the March 27 minutes were tabled for "internal review".

May — Administrative Transition: Following the April meeting, staff directed the return of all 2007 materials. This signaled a transition to the 2024 Report before the committee had formally reviewed or adopted it as a settled evidentiary base.

Summer 2025 — Governance Concerns: While regular meetings remained unscheduled, staff initiated a vote via email. Members raised concerns about the lack of public meetings.

September 25 — The "Materially Altered" Record: The committee approved the March 27 minutes. Subsequent review shows those minutes were materially different from the version previously tabled, including the additions of categorical "A and B" language. The April 30 minutes were not approved, and no approved minutes documenting actions taken at the September 25 meeting have been produced.

December — Expansion Without Oversight: Communication regarding new property acquisitions began while multiple sets of minutes remained unapproved and the transition from the 2007 to the 2024 Supporting Report remained procedurally unsettled.