

AD HOC URBAN RENEWAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Meeting Minutes

January 25, 2021 6:00 PM

NEWBERG CITY HALL

Meeting held electronically due to COVID-19 pandemic

(This is for historical purposes as meetings are permanent retention documents and this will mark this period in our collective history)

Chair John Bridges called the meeting to order at 5:31 pm

ROLL CALL

Members Present: John Bridges, Chair
Francisco Stoller, Vice Chair (arrived 5:40pm)
Stephanie Findley
Molly Olson
Don Clements
Joe Morelock, (arrived 6:00pm)
Josh Duder
Cassandra Ulven
Angel Aguiar
Loni Parrish, (arrived 6:10-pm)

Members Absent: Rick Rogers, excused

Staff Present: Doug Rux, Community Development Director
Brett Musick, Senior Engineer
Shannon Buckmaster, Economic Health Manager
Patrick Davenport, Senior Planner

CONSENT CALENDAR:

Approval of the November 9, 2020 and November 23, 2020 Ad Hoc Urban Renewal Citizens Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes

MOTION: Member Findley and Member Olson moved to approve the November 9, 2020 and November 23, 2020 Ad Hoc Urban Renewal Citizens Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes with noted changes, Motion carried 8/0

NEW BUSINESS:

Prioritization of project list to match financial capacity

Chair Bridges started with a free-form conversation and asked the following three questions:

1. Does the grouping of information make sense?

Member Olson noted she found it useful. She expressed challenges with the zoning, and what's industrial versus residential. Which parts of the road development, wastewater, water and sewer must be done together because it doesn't make sense to break them up? She found it useful talking about strategies for using the Urban Renewal dollars.

Member Ulven noted it was very useful to see it organized this way and thank you. It looks like all the projects met with our intent and she would welcome recommendations from staff as far as prioritizing it. She noted the costs exceed the maximum indebtedness at the 6% growth rate.

Member Clements noted he was unable to get all the information through email and that the problems were on his end. He will have to trust the others judgment.

Member Aguiar noted he will trust the group analyzing how this all comes together. As far as making any meaningful contribution yay or nay, he doesn't grasp how it's put together and he will leave that with those making those types of decisions.

Member Duder noted he did not access his City email to receive the information to access the packet on line.

Member Findley noted this looks better and as someone who's not an expert in this area she is able to conceptualize what we're talking about.

Chair Bridges noted this is one of those projects where we would benefit from looking at large maps in one room walking around and talking about it would be so much better. He noted going around the room with three or four questions for everyone to contribute their thoughts and to make sure that people feel they have good tool in terms of organization.

Member Stoller noted the material was very well organized.

2. What do you see as the most important projects and where?

Chair Bridges noted he is going around the room again to get a sense of how people feel. He heard two people say they are going to lean on staff, but staff really needs the Committee's input. Staff needs to hear for example, what is our priority for infrastructure and zoning? Can a sub-division be done or sub areas? Ultimately we need to pick the projects that align with the budget, or partially align with the funds coming from other resources. He asked for everyone's input on whether they value a particular infrastructure over other infrastructures.

Member Olson noted she values the set of infrastructure that turns on development. She is leery about fixing sidewalks in areas where it is already developed as part of Urban Renewal. If building a new road we're going to do the sidewalks at the same time. She thinks of it as a series of, if you do water, wastewater, sewer, roads and railroad crossing, she would go with Subarea A and part of Subarea B. She had trouble assigning the usages, which turns on a whole usage in an area where we don't have industrial property. She didn't look at them like one's more important than the other, but are some set of things we would have to make developable.

Chair Bridges noted it is fair to say these three infrastructure pieces that need to there. Stormwater can be dealt with on a site by site basis. That is an infrastructure he is hearing them saying, we don't have to provide for that, and if you just did the transportation, sanitary sewer, and water you have what you need.

Member Olson noted this is where we lean on staff, there are times where they may say for example, stormwater for this area the and cost would be a third of what it's going to be if everyone does their own. This is the kind of feedback needed from staff.

Member Ulven noted she shares what Member Olson is saying that staff has a better sense of timing and what's developable right now. The water line improvements to create a loop water system that extends into the industrial area getting closer to the Mill Site, seems like a comprehensive project that would afford a lot of opportunity within the adjacent sites. This is not the kind of project you can piecemeal so it makes sense that this is one of the starting projects to do. Again as CDD Rux mentioned right now we have someone that is ready to build if only the ingress and underground utilities were there to make the parcel developable. That's going to grow more increment faster and I trust the administrators of the plan to do that. What I like in all the areas of the projects, it's worthwhile investments for tax increment financing, with the exception of the trolley study by comparison small. Not knowing how shovel ready each Subarea Site is, she was unable to rank them.

Member Findley noted she leans towards those projects that if you build them development and investments will happen. The water projects would get us something new rather than improving the old to start out with. The Riverfront Trail is important in terms of balance between the things that people can and can't see. The public needs to see where the money is going. She would prioritize that to the top of my list in conjunction with some of the things that the public-at-large doesn't necessarily see, but are necessary in order for us to rebuild and draw in business.

Chair Bridges asked Member Findley about the esplanade and trails, which both are big areas, do you have a particular amongst them or do them all.

Member Findley responded, she does not lean more towards the trails or the esplanade as being a higher priority. I think that's where we're going to get a lot of support from the Community and people understand most of what Urban Renewal does for us.

Chair Bridges noted the trails and Esplanade go through different zones, residential, park setting and the industrial, would you have a strategy that is different for the different zones.

Member Findley responded, He thinks those kinds of projects are important, especially when we're building out and involve the Community. It is something where people that aren't going to enjoy other parts of this project are going to be drawn to it and the balance of making sure we are hitting different areas in terms of whose being served.

Member Aguiar agreed with Member Findley about if you build it they will come. He noted, my thought process is we want to start experiencing and getting success right off the bat. If we make a lot of capital improvements, a lot of investment, sit on that investment and wait for something else to happen after the infrastructure is done, what is the consequence. The downside to that is the potential of there's not a specific development saying we're going to do this if you accomplish this, if not in place all of a sudden it's a vast investment on the infrastructure and then we sit on it with nothing happening. This may have a reverse effect on what we're trying to accomplish. If we look at prioritizing, we can look at properties that already have come on-line and are willing to do this if this is done. If we can tackle those smaller projects with smaller dollar amounts we can start realizing success on those small projects and we can say now, that's what the Urban Renewal can do in the rest of these projects. We then have the Community buying into this and thinking great we're looking forward to other projects coming.

Member Clements noted he wouldn't prioritize one over the other, but has concerns with the 30 year timeline and asked if this is the set time frame.

Chair Bridges noted potentially it is a shorter time frame and we as a group said it could have a shorter timeframe or could have an indefinite time frame. We said that to be fair to the partners that we're doing the tax increment with, we want a hard deadline. The City Council are the ones that decide when it goes to City Council.

Member Clements noted not necessarily, the agencies also can opt out if they choose. 30 years is too long and he would recommend to the board we opt out, without some type of increment where it comes on the tax rolls. The second problem that he sees is the way this is going with the water, sewer, and stormwater. CPRD has done several projects that they always had to pay for it, why all of a sudden are we changing the system and giving something away that may or may not help the community. The trail system we've been working on and will continue to work on, but tax increment financing throws another step in the process. He's not necessarily opposed to it, but the question is whose going to come here because we have it or not come here because we don't have it. He noted system development charges (SDCs) have been charges CPRD pays for and they are for future growth. Increment financing can be used for what needs to be repaired.

Chair Bridges noted the topics Member Clements is bringing up we have already decided as a group to recommend to City Council. This is going to bring a tool to the City of Newberg that doesn't currently exist. It will bring more State funding to our community to allow us to have another tool to use in conjunction with SDCs. He noted the consultant isn't here right now but doesn't think you're correct in saying we can rebuild with this money, this has to be spent to leverage future development. We don't know who that company is going to be but we know this will make it more likely the

company will come to us. Particularly when other communities are taking advantage of this same tool and we're in a competitive market. With an employer that is going to invest millions of dollars in equipment is what gets the increment going. We need to position ourselves to be able to compete with other communities of like size. He has had conversations with CDD Rux that we want our management of this system to be saying for example, if we can do a trail in this area how do we apply for a grant from the State Parks Department. If we do a road in this area over here, and its eligible for 20% SDC, how about us paying it now and get repaid by the SDC when available because our plan is going to have a 30 year window and SDC are collected over a 20 year window. Our plan will last longer and can front load some of those expenses, get something built so people and businesses will come into the Community. We then get repaid over time, the same could be true of development cost, whether it is a local improvement district or advanced financing arrangement. This is all about trying to create another tool that gets more flexibility that can partner with more aspects of the City and leverage resources that are outside the City.

Member Clements noted he agrees with what Chair Bridges is saying if it does what he says it will do. He noted, there is an administrative cost that was put in the system for the next 30 years that is xx dollars. TVF&R and CPRD are giving a huge amount of money but we don't mind because it helps the community. He noted he feels we're not approaching this right because 30 years is a long time.

Chair Bridges noted it's a long time because it's a process that doesn't set aside funding at a very rapid rate.

Chair Bridges noted on the point were discussing at the moment is whether or not you have a preference over some infrastructure versus another. Is CPRD wanting to have trails or an esplanade built that is more important than water or roads?

Member Clements noted trails and those types of things would be more important to the Park District but at the same time infrastructure is also important and we're willing to look at that as well.

Member Duder noted from a Chamber of Commerce perspective, he'd be most interested in the type of infrastructure that goes in place to help attract businesses. The type of infrastructure that would help mixed buildings like vertical housing units, not only attracting businesses but also workforce housing. There might be some reimbursement projects or reimbursement money out there for those types of projects. As chair Bridges mentioned front loading the building project then seeking alternative funding to reimburse us for the effort.

Member Morelock noted they are moving ahead with high speed internet because they can't wait for the City. High speed infrastructure not just for the downtown core but to start thinking about attracting more people to the industrial area with maximum internet connectivity. They all need massive internet connectivity and we don't have it. 15 years ago high speed internet was put in the City of Canby, all the homes, fire department as well as the school. Here in our community we have been trying to provide internet hotspots to families all over and have distributed 750 to families that do not have internet connectivity in their area serving families with multiple kids. I do think internet connectivity in the area is of high importance. Things like water, stormwater pipes are huge dollar projects that you have to have to have a functional City and you've got to have the right kind of water pressure, not just for fire suppression but also getting water to all places. Projects such as the stormwater costs a lot of money to be digging up the street and these projects are huge. He feels it's important to do the core infrastructure pieces, they're super expensive but you need to have in the City. It's important to do core infrastructure pieces to bring people downtown, but thinks we can find other ways to do some of those, they may not be necessary through this funding stream. For example downtown Oregon City has done a nice job, there's a walkway along the side and redone the downtown area.

3. What types of development would you like to encourage?

Chair Bridges noted we have a variety of different zones that are in the URA, do you have an opinion as to what zone we are to prioritize working towards, whether it be industrial, residential, or parks.

Member Morelock noted he is looking at improving the ability for more businesses to come and so businesses don't leave because they can't expand because there is nowhere to go. He noted the waterfront areas are interesting and also likes the Old Downtown Area, people see that a lot when coming through town and there's a lot of value in that.

Chair Bridges noted one of the goals we're trying to do is what should we focus on first? There is residential zoned property, industrial zoned property, business zoned property and mixed business residential zoned. Which of these four types of zones you think is most important to work on first? He noted his choice is industrial because that's going to create the most tax base.

Member Morelock noted industrial is important and doesn't think we have enough. We don't have anywhere else to expand and we're going to attract new dollars into town with more industrial area. Building homes are relatively costly and you need people who can afford to work and live here. He would prioritize industrial because it will attract more development coming in.

Member Ulven noted she agrees, the earlier you do the industrial in the plan the sooner you'll build the increment which you can leverage for the future projects. She noted on the concerns Member Clements had about the tax revenue and what the overlapping taxing districts had to give up. We have 11 cities in our District with a lot of different Urban Renewal Agencies where we share those same concerns. The reality is Newberg has not seen improvements since it first forged your first plan for an Urban Renewal more than 20 years ago. You need some catalyst to be able to make these developments attract investments by private developers. Hopefully that will improve the assessed valuation far beyond what it would experience which will help all of the overlapping taxing district. She shares those concerns but the reality is Newberg doesn't have a lot of options, you can't go bond for all these projects you've identified. The way you've organized it in this plan staff has done, demonstrates that you're looking to do infrastructure that will invite private investment that is not occurring otherwise. That is the real goal, so we all have to do our part so it pays off, than we're a more livable area, with more valuation, more businesses and commerce which benefits everybody.

Member Stoller noted he wants to back the industrial plan because it's going to be the most important regarding bringing in jobs and businesses.

Member Duder asked if we have a recruitment plan for businesses.

CDD Rux responded yes we are currently working on putting together all the data points to be able to share with site selectors and businesses about the values and benefits of being located in Newberg.

Chair Bridges asked if there was one particular Subarea over another or geographic area would you focus on.

Member Parrish noted she had a hard time understanding and didn't fill out the form. She noted her focus would be on the Downtown Area and she didn't see that in the descriptions. The sections on the sewer lines also had a hard time understanding.

Chair Bridges noted the link on the website now has the material more organized showing Subarea A through Subarea H and the geographic areas are now more useful.

Member Olson noted industrial has to come first and will fund a lot of things, which makes since. She agrees with Member Findley in selecting a few small things that are highly visible, whether it's trails or a parking lot downtown. These are things that will buy a lot of good will with the public. Once we spend two years putting in roads and getting the Mill Site going, people are going to start saying, what are we getting for all this. She agrees with industrial first, because it brings in employment and businesses. As we go along we need to consider doing some things that help the current environment. You don't have to spend a lot, but just make it a visible value because it buys you goodwill. She noted in discussions with the downtown merchants on this list of projects parking is the first item that comes up in every conversation. Additional parking so the merchants don't feel like they're fighting with City employees for parking space. For example, build a trail in partnership with CPRD and then CPRD people feel their getting some value for the fact that we're forgoing our tax increment, so that it's a balanced strategy. She noted 95% needs to go towards industrial first.

Member Aguiar noted in Subarea A and as we start looking at making those improvements in that area, that there is something we foresee happening in the short-term with that area. Not just to make the infrastructure and wait for something to actually take place in the short-term. He asked if there was something going on with the Mill Site now.

CDD Rux set some context, as he heard some conversation about if you build it they will come, the Field of Dreams approach. The other end of the continuum is, you have a list of projects, an interested party comes in and we have negotiations with them, we're able to just in time build that infrastructure in conjunction with them building their new industrial building. So you're not spending a lot of money up front. That is the continuum I have to work with.

Chair Bridges noted industrial is number one, what priority would be our next one. He noted he heard trails and asked if anyone else can address other geographic areas or particular projects that they would have high on the list after industrial.

Member Ulven noted transportation connectivity and areas A, B and C, will help connect some of those industrial and business zoned areas. That will invite the much higher increment investments and you can parlay into additional projects that you want to see and feels good in the Community. The trails should be prioritized as the plan is a little more mature because they're not going to invite those industrial or small businesses. The transportation and water infrastructure connecting those big lots together will attract investments, and would be good to prioritize in the beginning of the plan.

Chair Bridges noted he has not heard yet that infrastructure or support of residential development is of importance.

Member Clements noted you're not going to be able to stop the residential development because it's already on its way.

Chair Bridges noted residential could be the lowest priority and that he would put the projects that benefit residential development lowest.

Member Clements noted he agrees, he would put industrial number 1, commercial number 2, commercial/residential mixed number 3 and residential number 4. He noted when the Mill closed it was not part of the City and the City did not receive any funding, but CPRD did. Since it's closed there valuation has gone down, so the sooner that is replaced the better for them and he feels this is a way to do that.

Member Ulven noted vertical and mixed use housing really maximizes a lot, attracts small businesses and makes other businesses want to locate there because there will be more people traffic. Residential is still on the lower priority, but in the ranking of residential she would want something where you get multi-level residential vs. single-family which isn't going to build your increment very fast or invite private investment.

Member Parrish noted Newberg needs affordable housing, which can be done in vertical ways such as apartments. She is going to push for the downtown improvement, businesses and more people would move here if there's more walkability. The two highways to get from First Street to the Cultural Center, making them more walkable areas would help. It would be nice to have some funding to help those projects downtown move forward faster. Parking is also an issue in Newberg's Downtown Area.

Member Duder asked where hotels and lodging fall into these four areas. It would be nice to fill in that TLT bucket once people start visiting our area with establishments for lodging and visitors.

Member Morelock noted vertical housing attracts a different kind of age bracket, they may not be looking for a home but want to live in an apartment closer to downtown area. Vertical housing shouldn't get lost, it is an important way to give downtown a more pedestrian feel. When you see pedestrians that makes you feel more pedestrian attractive.

Member Morelock noted he is for Subarea F, which is a significant connection point between the south and north part of town and it may not be a massive project but could be very important feeding all those homes along the way.

Chair Bridges noted as CDD Rux would say, that's a critical piece for the transportation system because you can't do all those new jobs in the industrial area without having capacity to meet the transportation plan. That is a critical feature along with two other road corridor areas that are necessary. For example the railroad crossing, you need better visibility at all those corners.

Member Olson asked about Subarea F, where it is labeled Center Street, but the work is called River Street.

CDD Rux responded it is River Street.

Recapped summary:

CDD Rux noted what he heard as takeaways. The Downtown Area he's hearing walkability, replacing sidewalks and other side streets is not a high priority. He heard infrastructure in the Downtown Area for vertical housing mix and the vertical component with the ground floor commercial with housing above and the infrastructure to do that is being able to go vertical with development. He heard transportation corridors coming from the Downtown Area to the Riverfront Area from Blaine Street and River Street is important. In the Riverfront Area industrial is the top priority, with corresponding infrastructure to support it. The mix of commercial in the Riverfront Area would be along Fourteenth Street and River Street with ground floor commercial and residential above. Playing off Member Ulven's comment, looping the water system, and staff also feels that's really important. That provides the fire flow and capacity and we have one water line now that runs through the Mill Site. There were comments about wastewater and the three things you need to have industry work is transportation, water and wastewater, pipes in/out. On the stormwater piece, he heard the comments that it could be dealt with more on the localized basis and that's kind of indicative way development is occurring. He feels we have the unique opportunity at the Mill Site with that one large pond. The north pond might be a water quality facility to help treat a large part of the Riverfront Area. This capsulates what he's hearing and takes a lot of projects that are on the long list and moves them below the 50% and some above the 50%. He noted that with Brett he will come back with a modified proposal, showing the projects in sub-areas A through H from your responses to your conversation this evening.

Member Stoller noted on the gravel roads close to downtown and thinking of those residences, is there a way to update some of these gravel roads.

CDD Rux noted Fifth Street to the west of Main was not in the boundary that the Committee identified. We also talked about trails and one of the things he was hearing were conversations about the esplanade, not as a top priority but something that could occur later.

Engineer Musick noted he agrees with the recap and range of things were working in. The topic on the stormwater that happens site by site is something that's going to happen. What we find are streets lacking the conveyance of storm drain lines and to get them moved from one area to another is what these costs are mostly related to. On what CDD Rux mentioned about the north pond on the Mill Site and its potential use, is actually a big project and was looked at in the Riverfront Master Plan. It is a nice idea, they're just a lot of pieces to go that direction and this would need to have more thought and also working with the property owner is a big part.

Chair Bridges asked if this was outside the scope of what we're talking about.

Engineer Musick noted a part of what can feed in that direction once we know more things are going, but it's only the stormwater compliance specifically and the conveyance of getting the water moved around and not the treatments so much, is how we've been looking at it.

CDD Rux added traffic signals and railroad crossings as a part of the Transportation System.

Member Olson asked when you're talking about doing the trails, have you sat down with CPRD to align a plan where they already have plans for certain areas.

CDD Rux responded yes we did that when we put together the Master Plan. We leveraged off the Heritage Trail System and the Bypass Trail. In the information you have it shows a section of the Bypass Trail from Wynyoski Road to River Street and from College Street to the end of Weatherly Way. The missing piece is how you get from River Street to College Street. CPRD and I have talked through that with their consultant on how that can occur. There was the esplanade piece. There's the connections that takes you to parks, Ewing Young Park to Levitt Park and Hess Creek Trail. In the future CPRD is working on a grant for a piece of the Bypass Trail from Industrial Parkway to Wynyoski and then down the river.

Member Clements noted one of their biggest projects right now is building a bridge across Hess Creek, which is about \$2 million, which we put a grant in for. The next big project will be Chehalem Creek, which we will be working with ODOT, the City, the County and the Bypass Committee with also the Congressional Delegation on board as well.

Member Olson noted parking is a priority.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

None

ITEMS FROM STAFF:

CDD Rux noted he wanted to let the Committee know that we have engaged a consultant who is starting to work on the legal description based on the boundary you identified in the feasibility study. We've given them a deadline of the end of March to the first part of April. Elaine Howard is not with us tonight and will not be in the next meeting. He noted he and Brett are trying to work through with the Committee about the prioritization of the projects. He will watch where we're at so when you get down to a shorter list at your next meeting or the meeting after that we will bring back Elaine and talk about the growth rate in the project values.

CDD Rux noted February 22 is the next meeting.

Chair Bridges asked if the meeting packet would be shorter next meeting.

CDD Rux noted yes, the packet will be significantly shorter as we make this list shorter. There will be an agenda, your minutes, a revised excel spreadsheet and the maps. We will not be sending the Master Plan report on infrastructure you already have that material for you to use as background pieces.

ITEMS FROM COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

Member Clements noted currently it is a 30 year plan, can we put in areas that we can look at after 10 years, 15 years, 20 years and put back on the tax roll.

Chair Bridges responded you create the plan and then within the plan we look at every 5 years, so you have 6 looks at everything. We will have an administrator looking at the plan every year and watching the plan for opportunities that come forward. For example there's this great opportunity for mixed use over here but we'd have to build those pipes in and out rather than in the plan in 6 years.

CDD Rux noted suggestions he shared with the City Council when they created the Urban Renewal Agency was establishing a standing Urban Renewal Advisory Committee. That takes it out of just being a staff function but there would be a committee that we would constantly look at projects, make recommendations, get into development agreements, and public input before decisions are made.

Member Olson commented on the real good job leading us all through a lot of information, well done.

ADJOURNMENT:

Chair Bridges adjourned meeting at 6:56pm

**APPROVED BY THE AD HOC URBAN RENEWAL CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE this
February 22, 2021**

A stylized handwritten signature in blue ink, consisting of a large 'J' and 'B' followed by a large loop.

John Bridges, UR CAC Chair

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads 'Doug Rux' in a cursive style.

Doug Rux, Recording Secretary