

NEWBERG URBAN RENEWAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (NURAC)

**Newberg Public Safety Building - Newberg, Oregon
TUESDAY, AUGUST 27, 2002 AT 6 P.M.**

Approved at the September 24, 2002, NURAC Meeting

I. NURAC COMMITTEE ROLL CALL

NURAC Committee Members Present (7):

John Bridges, Chair Kristen Horn Louis Larson, Vice Chair
Dave Mehler Cinda Schneggenburger
Mike Sturdevant

Absent: Irene Rose

Staff Present:

David Beam, Economic Development Coordinator/Planner
Katherine Tri, Finance Director
Peggy Hall, Recording Secretary

II. OPEN MEETING

David Beam opened the meeting at 6:10 p.m.

III. CONSENT CALENDAR

1. Approval of NURAC Meeting minutes from the July 23, 2002 meeting.

Motion #1:	Larson/Schneggenburger to approve the July 23, 2002 minutes.
-------------------	---

Vote on Motion #1:	The Motion carried (6 Yes/1 Absent [Rose]).
---------------------------	--

IV. URD Budget

David Beam and Kathy Tri provided a brief overview of the URD budget approved for 2002/03 fiscal year. Mrs. Tri stated that the majority of the materials and services line items were to support Mr. Beam's staffing services to the Committee.

V. POTENTIAL PROJECTS - COST ESTIMATES

1. Public Restrooms

Mr. Beam reviewed the cost estimate for a public bathroom. The estimate ranged from \$100,000 to \$135,000 (excluding land), depending upon the quality of materials desired. Committee members asked about available public lands downtown to place the bathroom. Mr. Beam mentioned the Second Street Parking lot, the old car dealership site, and the empty lot across Sheridan Street from Central School. Ms. Horn mentioned the new public parking lot across on Hancock Street.

2. Streetscape Plan

Mr. Beam provided an overview of the cost estimate for this item, which was provided by the McKenzie Group. He stated that a short-term conceptual plan would cost about \$12,000 and a complementary long-term plan would cost about \$12,000.

Kristen Horn reminded the Committee members that this project was considered important because there is no plan to conceptual guide the streetscape revitalization of the downtown.

Cinda Schneggenburger sought information on how the buildings could be fixed up downtown.

Mr. Bridges said that he believed the Committee discussed pursuing a positive visual approach in utilizing the funds now and if the City Council chose to do so, the Council could provide loan funding and programs to fix up the buildings. Ms. Schneggenburger asked if the City could establish design standards at the C-3 zone. Mr. Beam said the Council just approved some new development standards for commercial zones last spring. The new design standards for buildings downtown were created to complement the early 20th century architecture of the majority of downtown buildings. The Sign Committee also provided input for the downtown sign standards.

Mr. Sturdevant asked if awning design standards existed.

Mr. Bridges responded that the new sign standards addressed that issue.

Mr. Jim Morrison was present in the audience and mentioned that the city had placed an historic district designation on the downtown years ago.

Mr. Beam stated that he believed the proposed historic district designation was never adopted. Individual buildings can be historic landmarks through.

Mr. Bridges inquired about Phase 1 and what tasks could the City staff handle to lower the cost of implementing this phase. Mr. Bridges said he was hesitant to spend any money than necessary for planning purposes. He thought that utilization of consultants is a bad idea in some people's mind, although it was helpful to have outside input and ideas from different communities. Mr.

Bridges added that some people have a real aversion to consultants.

Mr. Beam said when trying to do a concept plan, it is difficult to capture urban design ideas without outside expertise (knowing what works and what does not). He said staff could do parts of the plan, but someone has to put the ideas together into a cohesive concept plan. That's what urban designers are trained to do.

Ms. Tri said the City's engineering staff is pretty booked.

Mr. Bridges said the civil engineering is minor, but traffic engineering may be more involved. Discussion was held concerning working in partnership with the City staff in coordinating the development process. Mr. Bridges felt that we should be able to bring in ODOT's pedestrian coordinator for assistance.

Ms. Horn said the City has to charge for its staff time and questioned what money savings would be saved in the long run? Mr. Bridges said that the Committee should be sensitive to the staff's time.

Ms. Tri said city staff time would be charged to the urban renewal fund.

Mr. Bridges asked Mr. Beam what the City staff could reasonably do and what other staff members could cover certain other components to create the streetscape plan. He requested that Mr. Beam provide cost estimates and what savings would result from the coordination of City staff with the consultant in getting the project completed.

Mr. Beam reviewed Phase 2 alternatives contained in the staff report (Group MacKenzie). Mr. Bridges asked for clarification of the \$125,000 construction comment in the estimate. Mr. Beam responded that he believed that the consultant was saying they could do the engineering work for \$17,000 for a construction project worth \$125,000. Mr. Beam added said that makes engineering costs about 15% of a project budget, which is pretty normal.

3. Second Street Parking Lot Renovation

Mr. Beam reviewed cost estimates for renovating the parking lot. He provided two cost estimates: the lower estimate would only provide an asphalt overlay and the higher estimate would provide a complete surface rebuild. Mr. Beam said the estimates include bringing the parking lot up to current code standards, which would eliminate some parking spaces and require some power poles would have to be relocated. Discussion was held concerning inquiring whether PGE would be interested in undergrounding the utilities. Discussion was held concerning not doing some projects to eliminate having to re-do them at a later time. Mr. Beam said the parking lot light utilities could be undergrounded. Discussion was held concerning the use of the alley-way being congested and inappropriate signage being placed for traffic control.

Mr. Bridges discussed the over-lay costs in relation to removal and replacement (new gravel,

rock, etc.). Discussion was held concerning the time period in which the parking lot would have to be re-done after an overlay. Mr. Beam said it would depend but an overlay would last maybe 5 years and the complete rebuild would last much longer.

Mr. Bridges said we must be careful with our choices of vegetation (trees) which seasonally drop things on the street/sidewalks/automobiles. Ms. Tri said the project will probably overlap in two fiscal years, so funding for project option could be made available. Ms. Tri said the parking lot is not eligible for gas tax, so any other city money for the project would have to come from the general fund.

4. Downtown Trash Cans

Mr. Beam said Russ Thomas, Public Works Director, estimates that the cost of an average nice-looking, durable trash receptacle container would be \$600. Using the one can per street block, he estimated that we would need about 126 trash receptacles in the downtown C-3 zone (First, Second, Hancock Streets, and cross streets) and the Civic Corridor. Estimated purchase costs for the receptacles would be \$75,600.00. This cost could obviously be reduced by purchasing a lower quality receptacle and/or reducing the number of receptacles. An option might be to do this project in phases, such as receptacles on First and/or Hancock Street now and then Second Street in the future date when business increases in that area. Installation costs depends upon type of installation desired/required (maybe 50% of receptacle purchase cost as a working number). Mr. Thomas commented that, in the past, business owners were often resistant to having trash receptacles in front of their businesses.

Mr. Beam said there are only approximately 5 trash cans in the area now and are in much need of repair. The project could be phased in. The Public Works crew would have to empty and maintain the trash cans, so consideration must be given to this cost. Urban renewal funds cannot be used for operation and maintenance. Mr. Thomas had indicated to him that in the past, business owners were often resistant in having trash receptacles in front of their businesses. Discussion was held concerning providing policies or having the business owners be responsible for emptying the recycling bins. Mr. Bridges said that the owner of the property could impose an additional amount in the lease to cover the trash can collection costs. Discussion was held concerning strategically placing the trash receptacles in high volume areas. **Mr. Beam** reviewed economic improvement districts (EID) which are assessments on properties and business improvement districts (BID) are where the assessments are on the business owner. He stated that many downtowns fund programming and maintenance tasks through these types of programs. Discussion was held concerning phasing in the project.

Tape 1 - Side 2:

Discussion was held concerning streetscaping plans and the selection of trash receptacles.

Mr. Louis Larson addressed the current trash and dirt along the downtown streets and their negative effects on the area. The group further discussed trash in the streets and the possible

ways of organizing a clean-up of the area.

Safety and Directional Signage.

Mr. Beam indicated that after some discussion with Committee member Kris Horn, he estimated that we could install up to 46 signs. Russ Thomas indicated that we could plan for approximately \$100 per sign in the estimate (70% to make the sign, 30% cost of installation). Therefore, an estimated total cost to install new signs would be approximately \$4,600 (any needed permits from ODOT may be an additional cost). The following signs are proposed:

Pedestrian signs in alley-ways	31
Second Street Parking Lot and Breezeway	7
Hoover-Minthorn House	2
BMX/Skateboard Park	2
Pedestrian "Caution" signs at entrances to downtown	2
Riverfront	2

Discussion was held concerning pedestrian safety and alley signs. Some of the signs would require the permission of property owners to place the alley signs and the City will have to work with them. Discussion was held concerning the potential traffic issues regarding the Hoover-Minthorn House directional signs.

Ms. Horn said we need to investigate the costs and the seasonal value in such signs. Discussion was held concerning adding additional pedestrian crossing signs in a variety of areas where they would make a big impact on the main roads. Ms. Horn said that the public has requested better signage for the downtown for many years.

David Mehler addressed the need for "no truck engine brake" signs to prevent the loud noise rumbling through the downtown corridor. Discussion was held whether or not the city had any ordinance about the use of "jake brakes" within the City.

Mr. Bridges asked members if they wanted to discuss any additional projects not previously mentioned. He added that funds could not be spent until after the election. Mr. Beam discussed having a walking tour of the downtown with Mr. Bridges to devise a trash can phasing plan. We should verify a non-standard non-green sign and costs. Mr. Beam said that the Sign Committee has held discussions to talk about a standard schematic for signs before placing any signs in the corridor. Mr. Beam said the Sign Committee had given some direction when the new development standards were being created. Ms. Tri said First Street is a state highway and there are national standards for signs (reflective, etc.). Mr. Beam said he would check with ODOT on the highway standards, the flexibility for uniformity purposes and to see what alternative signs ODOT could provide.

VI. URD INITIATIVE

Mr. Beam said the City requested and received a legal opinion on the initiative and ballot measure to repeal the urban renewal plan. Mr. Beam said that the opinion stated that a lot of the questions asked regarding the potential impacts of the initiative have not been addressed by the legal system.

Mr. Bridges said the ballot has been placed on the November election and the ballot measure was sent on as drafted (un-retouched). He said he was concerned about sending it to the voters which may have some legal and problematic issues. These legal questions may still affect the initiative, notwithstanding what happens at the ballot.

Mr. Bridges said the Council created an urban renewal agency in the fall of 2001, and actually approved the urban renewal plan in December. The ballot title suggested that it wanted to undue the plan (December item) but he questioned the language referencing the Ordinance establishing the agency. There is some confusion as to what is being eliminated, the plan or the agency?

Discussion was held concerning not questioning the contradiction. Ms. Tri clarified Mr. Bridges' statement in that the initiative was appealing the agency and not the reference to the plan. Discussion was held concerning challenging the initiative.

VII. COMMITTEE MEMBER TERM LENGTHS

The committee addressed the staggering their term limits on the committee. The proposed term limits were as follows:

Present - through 2003

Mike Sturdevant
David Mehler

Through 2004

Cinda Schneggenburger
Kristen Horn

Through 2005

Irene Rose
John Bridges
Louis Larson

Motion #2:	Horn/Sturdevant to accept the above staggered terms.
-------------------	---

Vote on Motion #1:	The Motion carried (6 Yes/1 Absent [Rose]).
---------------------------	--

VIII. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Next Meeting: Tuesday, September 24, 2002

Mr. Beam addressed the following:

- The State has a small amount of money for public arts (Oregon Arts Commission) and he passed out the guidelines for the grant program. He mentioned that one of the goals of

the use of urban renewal funds was to leverage outside funds for projects. He said the committee could keep this funding source in mind for future projects.

- Mr. Dave Vangrunsven had been emailing the City giving ideas about the revitalization of the downtown area. Mr. Beam asked the committee members if they wanted to see copies of the emails. The committee members said yes, so Mr. Beam handed out copies of the emails. Mr. Beam mentioned that Mr. Vangrunsven stated that he had previously been on the Newberg Budget Committee and was an economist.

Kristen Horn talked about a past PGE grant to help fix up the Second Street Parking lot. Ms. Horn said the Chamber received some information concerning this. Ms. Horn said she would provide this information to Mr. Beam, who would then find out if the assistance program was still valid.

Mr. Sturdevant talked about an email list of the members. Since Ms. Schneggenburger does not have access to email, the committee decided that an email list was not necessary.

Mr. Bridges asked the committee if the 6:00 p.m. meeting start time still was OK. The committee members indicated that yes, that was still their preference. Mr. Bridges also requested that committee members notify Mr. Beam if they are not available for a meeting a few days prior to the meeting. If it looks like a quorum will not be available, a decision will be made whether or not to cancel that meeting.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 7:45 p.m.

Passed by the NURAC Committee of the City of Newberg this 24 day of Sept, 2002.

AYES: 7 NO: 0 ABSTAIN: ABSENT: 0
(list names)

ATTEST:

Peggy Hall

9-24-02