MINUTES OF A JOINT MEETING OF
NEWBERG CENTENNIAL REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
AND THE TRAFFIC/DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT SUBCOMMITTEE
OF NCRC

June 24, 1985 ~~7:30 PM~~ 7:00 Velvet Carriage Restaurant

NCRC Members Present:
Alan Halstead
Bruce Breitling
Hal Grobey
Art Moffat
Quentin Probst

Members Absent:
LeRoy Benham
Elvern Hall

Traffic/Downtown Development Sub-Committee
Members Present:
Alan Halstead
Bruce Breitling
Hal Grobey
Art Moffat
Bob Emmerich
Earl Sandager
Sam Zanghi

Staff Present:
Mike Warren, Executive Director
Clay Moorhead, Executive Secretary
Rick Faus, City Attorney
Greg DiLoreto, City Engineer
Arvilla Page, City Recorder

corrected time

The meeting was called to order by Vice-Chairman Halstead.

Motion: Grobey-Probst to approve the June 19, 1985 minutes of the Newberg Centennial Redevelopment Commission Traffic Downtown Development Committee. Carried unanimously by all those present.

Mr. Warren reported that the Traffic/Downtown Development Committee has been working at selecting consultants to complete the traffic study, market study and downtown development plan. They have worked on this project for many months and have reviewed four specific proposals presented by consulting teams to complete the work. The Committee has identified that the best consulting proposal is from the Carl Buttke team. Carl Buttke would be joined by two other consulting firms to complete the project. Their names are Walker & Macy and Leland & Hobson. Carl Buttke is noted by many professionals to be the leading professional in the area of transportation planning. Walker & Macy is a planning firm which specializes in urban design and landscape architecture and Leland & Hobson is a consulting firm which specializes

in marketing. The consultants originally proposed to complete the project for $82,800. Through negotiations with staff and the Sub-committee the price was reduced to $68,600. This includes approximately $3,600 to complete an origin destination survey to obtain traffic and marketing data which will be used to complete the plan.

Mr. Warren indicated that he had sent a letter to each of the budget committee members relating to the meeting this morning and had identified within the letter that he would make a recommendation that funds be used from this fiscal year to initiate the traffic/downtown development plan. He indicated that this last year the budget committee and the Redevelopment Agency had approved a line item to complete this project and had budgeted approximately $60,000 within the 1984-85 fiscal year budget. Not knowing what the actual cost of conducting this project would be, the funds were re-budgeted into the 1985-86 fiscal year at approximately $40,000. Mr. Warren indicated that during the budget committee meeting the budget committee had discussed the option of placing funds that were originally identified for special projects into a contingency reserve account. The committee made this recommendation to NCRC in order to obtain more specific information about special projects relating to economic development or incentive programs for attracting or expanding new businesses and industries within the redevelopment area. In order to utilize these funds for special projects, a contingency transfer would have to be made through a public hearing process with a review by the budget committee.

The traffic/downtown development plan was specifically identified and budgeted within the 1985-86 fiscal year budget, as well as in the 1984-85 fiscal year budget. This plan was not considered to be a special project by the budget committee and they reviewed it separately from items proposed to be funded through the special project account. Mr. Warren indicated that no comments or phone calls were received from any of the budget committee members over the weekend. Mr. Grobey also indicated that he did not receive any phone calls or comments from any of the budget committee members. Mr. Grobey was listed on Mr. Warren's letter as an additional person that could be contacted. Mr. Warren indicated that there are six members of the budget committee that are in the meeting today.

Discussion then ensued on whether this project should again be reviewed by the budget committee. Commissioner Halstead indicated that it might be appropriate to go back to the budget committee. Commissioner Grobey indicated that this matter was previously budgeted in the 1984-85 fiscal year budget and was approved by the budget committee and NCRC this year as well as last year. Commissioner Grobey stated that it is not necessary to go back to the budget committee because this project was specifically designated as a line item in both fiscal years and that adequate money is available to conduct this project.

The City Attorney stated that the Commission is not legally required to go back to the budget committee for approval of a contingency transfer.

Gary Baldwin, who is a member of the budget committee, agreed that this matter was discussed as a specific line item through the budget process

and indicated that he felt it was not necessary that the budget committee review this project again.

Commissioner Grobey stated that he would prefer to encumber the money this fiscal year.

Commissioner Moffat suggested that a motion should be made by the Redevelopment Commission relating to the recommendation from the Traffic/Downtown Development Committee on the consultant proposals.

Motion: Moffat-Breitling to accept the recommendation of the Traffic/Downtown Development Committee to contract with Carl Buttke for the traffic study, market analysis and downtown development plan for a fee not to exceed $68,600. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion: Grobey-Breitling to encumber $28,600 in the 1984-85 fiscal year budget which would be supplemented by $40,000 budgeted in the 1985-86 fiscal year budget to support the total cost of the project.

The Commission members discussed the motion on the floor. Through the discussion the Commission concurred that it was appropriate to encumber the entire amount of the project to insure that it could be completed. Further discussion was held on how to encumber the funds. City Attorney Rick Faus indicated that to encumber the funds would be to irrevocably pledge tax increment revenue to support the project cost.

Motion Amendment: Moffat-Probst to encumber and irrevocably pledge the entire $68,600 from the 1984-85 fiscal year budget. Motion carried by a unanimous vote of members present.

Vote on Main Motion as amended: Motion carried by a unanimous vote of the members present.

Mr. DiLoreto then went over the scope of work to be conducted by the consultants and described some of the projects that would be completed. He indicated that some parts of the overall project will be conducted by City staff and volunteers.

The Commission then discussed the timing of conducting this plan. Mr. Baldwin stated that NCRC has to continue moving ahead with this project. He stated that people have criticized the redevelopment plan because of its lack of detail and that the creation of a traffic study, a market study and a downtown development plan will give the people what they have been looking for.

Mr. Breitling stated that it is important that the Agency not buy part of a study that would have no value, and therefore, it was very important that the Agency encumber enough money to complete the entire study regardless of the outcome of the vote on NCRC in September.

Mr. Faus stated that the motion made by the Agency irrevocably pledged tax increment revenue to complete this project.

The Commissioners then discussed the three options the City Council will have when the initiative petition is presented to the Council. Each alternative was discussed briefly.

Motion: Moffat-Probst that NCRC recommend to the Newberg City Council that the Council not offer a competing measure and that they publicly support the Redevelopment Commission efforts. Motion carried with one abstention (Grobey).

There being no further business the meeting was then adjourned at 8:00 AM.