

**URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY BOARD OF DIRECTORS REGULAR
MEETING AGENDA**

CITY OF SHERWOOD POLICE FACILITY
20495 SW BORCHERS ROAD
TUESDAY, APRIL 27, 2004
FOLLOWING THE REGULAR CITY COUNCIL MTG

- 1. Call to Order**
- 2. Roll Call**
- 3. Consent Agenda**
 - A. Approve Minutes from the March 23, 2004 URA Board meeting
- 4. New Business**
 - A. **URA Resolution 2004-005, Blight Removal and Rebuild Grant Program**
(District Manager Jim Patterson)
 - B. **URA Resolution 2004-006 Adopting the City of Sherwood Personnel Rules for Urban Renewal Agency Employees** (District Manager Jim Patterson) Deferred from March 23, 2004 URA meeting.
- 5. Adjourn with Executive Session of Sherwood City Council immediately following.**

**URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY BOARD OF DIRECTORS
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES**

CITY OF SHERWOOD POLICE FACILITY
20495 SW BORCHERS ROAD
SHERWOOD, OR 97140

TUESDAY, March 23

1. **Call to Order:** Chair Cottle called the meeting to order at 8:25 p.m.
2. **Roll Call:** Chair Cottle, Co-Chair Mays, Mr. Durrell, Mr. Fox, Mr. Grant, Mr. Heironimus and Mr. Weislogel
3. **Consent Agenda**
 - A. Approve Minutes from the February 24, 2004 URA Board Meeting – It was noted the Minutes to be approved are from the January 27, 2004 URA Board Meeting

UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED BY ALL MEMBERS PRESENT

4. **Other Business**

A. Introduction of Urban Renewal District Manager (District Administrator Ross Schultz) Jim Patterson was introduced as the Urban Renewal District Manager and only Urban Renewal District employee. Mr. Schultz requested item B (Adopt City Employee Manual) pulled from the agenda. Mr. Patterson will bring this item forward at the next URA Board of Directors meeting.

B. Adopt City Employee Manual (District Manager Jim Patterson) This item was pulled from the agenda.

C. Minor Amendment to Urban Renewal Plan (District Administrator Ross Schultz and Senior Project Manager Jenni Lipscomb)

1. Resolution 2004-004 was distributed to Council for consideration. (See Attachment A to these minutes). Ms. Lipscomb noted the resolution reflects recommendations made by Sherwood Urban Renewal Policy Advisory Committee (SURPAC) regarding changes the Board had previously requested.

2. Staff recommends the “must have” projects on the list are the two phases of transportation funding and the Cultural Arts Strategy. It is suggested no new projects be initiated until the construction bids are in on Phases 1 & 2 of the Street Plan.

3. Mr. Durrell stated there are two factors at work: a) priorities are based on the quality of the projects, and b) a chronological factor. Because the numbers are budgetary, there could be a situation in which a higher priority project could be displaced by a lower priority project simply because the lower priority project could be built first. SURPAC recommends waiting a year to start any new projects.

4. Urban Renewal District Manager Jim Patterson indicated SURPAC wants to assure projects "in the pipeline" like the library, all phases of the street project, items like the turf fields and the Cultural Arts Strategy are at the top of the "must have" list.

5. Mr. Heironimus said he did not understand how the turf field and the Cultural Arts Strategy are considered "in the pipeline." The turf field Request for Proposal (RFP) is just going out and the Cultural Arts Strategy has not been started.

6. Mr. Durrell suggested the idea is not to commit dollars, whether the project has been started or not, beyond a certain contingency level (10% - 20% of funds remaining).

7. Mr. Heironimus was concerned about the City's debt ratio Mr. Schultz had talked about at the January 10, 2004 Council goal setting meeting. At that time, Mr. Schultz had advised Council not to take on anything new. Mr. Heironimus did not want to have to borrow money for any projects.

8. Chair Cottle thought, on January 10, 2004, Mr. Schultz was assuming there were certain things like the library, the turf fields, the streets, and telecommunications that would be done. Beyond those four projects, the District would be above the desired debt ratio to do any other projects. However, because the streets bid will not be provided for a year, this will change the ratio dynamic.

9. Mr. Heironimus thought it would be prudent to get firm prices on the streets and the Civic Building before moving forward on another project. He said projects often come in higher than expected.

10. Chair Cottle said he understood the rationale but did not feel projects should be put off for a year. He felt SURPAC's recommendation should be adopted to do the four projects (Civic Building, streets, turf fields and the Cultural Arts Strategy) and then reevaluate.

11. Street construction will not be started until December of 2004. Chair Cottle pointed out, this is about eight months behind schedule and the money for that project is sitting in the bank. He suggested that money could be used for the turf fields or telecommunications.

12. District Administrator Ross Schultz said the District will be in a slightly better position because the next incremental tax amount will come in and will raise the borrowing capacity.

13. Senior Project Manager Jenni Lipscomb reminded the Board, the SURPAC recommendation includes the Cultural Arts Strategy. Chair Cottle said his understanding is no one expects anything to be done in the next year, just the assurance it will.

14. Mr. Schultz pointed out the turf field RFP will come before the Board. This will allow the Board to see it in light of other funding elements in the Plan before staff asks for approval.

15. Chair Cottle felt it was disingenuous for the Board to put things before the citizens and then not do them for a few years. Mr. Heironimus felt things should not be dated or promised. He felt it was foolish to go ahead with more projects without firm numbers on the projects currently being undertaken.

16. Co-Chair Mays felt the paragraph on the recommendation for "must haves" could be deleted and the Plan updated as the Board uses good judgment in moving forward.

17. Urban Renewal Manager Jim Patterson said SURPAC wanted some assurance as the dollars and the projects are being considered, certain things need to be included over and above some of the other projects listed. He felt, at the last SURPAC meeting, members had come to the realization the Urban Renewal District will soon move forward with a project or two that people can get their arms around. Some members may also have realized there are elements of the Urban Renewal Plan that the District Board has put at a higher priority level because of timing. SURPAC feels the Cultural Arts Strategy can run concurrently with the Tournament Town NW concept.

18. Mr. Patterson said if SURPAC is making a recommendation, they want it to stand as they wrote it. However, a number of SURPAC members concede, the District Board is in a position to do as they choose.

MOTION: From Co-Chair Mays, seconded by Mr. Weislogel, to approve URA Resolution 2004-004. Motion passed 6:1. (Cottle, Durrell, Fox, Grant, Mays, and Weislogel in favor; Heironimus opposed).

C. Façade Grant Application from Jim Fisher (District Manager Jim Patterson)

1. Mr. Patterson asked the Board to consider an application (sent to the Board via email) from Jim Fisher for a façade grant in the amount of \$15,000 in order for Mr. Fisher to have a mural painted on the side of the storage facility adjacent to the parking lot for the new Library/Civic Building.

2. Chair Cottle raised the issue of who will see the mural after the Library/Civic Building is constructed.

3. Mr. Durrell questioned whether or not Mr. Fisher's three sided facility is "a building." He felt the purpose of a façade grant is to improve the value and standards of the City's buildings.

4. Co-Chair Mays asked if Mr. Fisher's structure is a conforming use. Chair Cottle reminded the Board, it is not whether the building is conforming, but the use of the building.

5. Chair Cottle asked the Board if when the façade grant was established that it would be used for art work. Their response was in the negative. Chair Cottle asked staff to tell Mr. Fisher he is offering a great gift. However, the Board does not feel this is purpose of the façade grant, nor would it be the appropriate place for a mural.

6. Mr. Patterson was asked if a mural would be affected by the sign code. In response, Mr. Patterson said murals are not currently discussed in the City's Code.

7. Staff was asked to convey to SURPAC the façade grant is for increasing the value or standard of a building.

MOTION: From Chair Cottle, seconded by Mr. Weislogel, to deny the façade grant. UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED BY ALL MEMBERS PRESENT

D. Clancy's Façade Grant (District Manager Jim Fisher)

1. SURPAC has recommended denial of the façade grant, as submitted, based on the fact some members are of the opinion the project does not meet the requirements. Additionally, members of the Board did not envision a façade grant paying for a shed in place of an existing structure. It was suggested Mr. Fisher and Ms. Carey meet with the applicant and offer some feedback as to what would be an acceptable proposal.

2. Chair Cottle expressed concern that it appeared the Board was "bending over backward" for a SURPAC member. On the other hand, he said the building is deteriorating and it would be good to see something done to improve the appearance and the safety of the building.

3. Mr. Patterson noted the City has a number of alternatives including condemnation.

4. Mr. Weislogel related the owners are in a better financial position and are more amenable to making some improvements. It was suggested the owner request money from SURPAC apart from the façade grant.

5. **Adjourn:** Chair Cottle adjourned the meeting at 8:52 p.m.

District Board Meeting: 4/27/04

To: Sherwood Urban Renewal District Board

From: Jim Patterson, UR District Manager

SUBJECT: URA Resolution 2004-005 Blight Removal & Rebuild Grant Program

Issue

Should the Sherwood Urban Renewal District approve a program for the removal and rebuild of blighted structures in the Old Town overlay zone?

Background

In late 2003 on a number of occasions, District Board members were approached by citizens asking that blighted structures be removed and new, improved building stock take its place. In keeping with the goals of the Urban Renewal Plan, Goal B, "Rehabilitate Building Stock" and the directive of the District Board from the March 18, 2004 meeting a program called "Blight Removal and Rebuild Grant Program" is attached as Exhibit A, to resolution 2004-005.

This program will allow any property owner who uses their building in Old Town for retail or commercial endeavors, a source of matching funds up to \$15,000 from the district.

Financial Analysis

This program will be a discretionary pool, funded from the Districts General Fund, and or the existing Façade Grant Program allocation. Grants will be issued in no more than the \$15,000 increments and will be matching funds. The applicant must submit a bill for work completed before any re-imbusement will be authorized.

Recommendation

MOVE TO APPROVE THE URA Resolution 2004-005, a resolution authorizing the District Manager & District Administrator to establish the Blight Removal and Rebuild Grant Program.

Attachment:

1. URA Resolution 2004-005 with Exhibit A

URA Resolution 2004-005

**A RESOLUTION FORMALIZING THE BLIGHT REMOVAL AND REBUILD
GRANT PROGRAM**

WHEREAS, Urban Renewal Agency District Board members were approached by citizens asking that blighted structures be removed and new, improved building stock take its place; and,

WHEREAS, in keeping with the goals of the Urban Renewal Plan, Goal B, "Rehabilitate Building Stock" and the directive from the District Board from the March 18, 2004 meeting, a program called "Blight Removal and Rebuild Grant Program" is attached hereon as Exhibit A; and

WHEREAS, this program will allow any property owner who uses their building in Old Town for retail or commercial endeavors, a source of matching funds up to \$15,000 from the district;

NOW THEREFORE THE URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY RESOLVES AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. This program will be a discretionary pool, funded from the District's General Fund and/or the existing Façade Grant Program allocation. Grants will be issued in no more than \$15,000 increments and will be matching funds.

Section 2. The applicant must submit a bill for work completed before any re-imbusement will be authorized. The improvements must be deemed completed and in compliance with District standards by the District Administrator or his/her designee prior to payment.

Section 3. This Resolution shall be effective upon its approval and adoption.

Duly passed by Urban Renewal Agency this 27th day of April, 2004.

Mark O. Cottle, Board Chair

Attest:

C.L. Wiley, District Recorder

URA Resolution 2004-005 Exhibit A

City of Sherwood Urban Renewal District
Old Town Blight Removal & Re Build Grant Program
April 2004

Program Scope – This program is being proposed to provide a discretionary pool of money for the demolition and removal of blighted structures and the subsequent and immediate rebuild and renewal of these structures in the Old Town overlay zone.

Funding Source – This pool of money will be funded entirely by the Urban Renewal District.

Program Guidelines – The following guidelines will be used to administer the Program:

1. Any money provided by this program must be used for the removal or demolition and rebuild of an existing structure located in Old Town. These structures must be used for mixed use, or commercial use.
2. All dollars provided by this program must be matched by an equal amount of money provided by the applicant.
3. All requests for money will be made using a form provided by the District. The full SURPAC Committee or Urban Renewal Board will review each application for support and will award grants based on the project proposed.
4. The Program Pool is discretionary. Grants will be awarded in an amount not to exceed \$15,000 per grant application.
5. Applicants may apply as many times as they wish, however, generally one grant per year per property will be awarded. Exceptions will be made by SURPAC or the District Board depending on number of applications and amount of money spent for the year.
6. Each application will be reviewed by staff and recommended to SURPAC or the District Board for action. The Board will make the final award by resolution.
7. Money up to the grant amount will be awarded with-in 14 days of presentation of a receipt for the project. Each receipt award will be in the amount of 50% of the receipt.



Old Town "Blight Removal & ReBuild" Grant Application

Date of Application: _____ Review Date: _____

Business Information

Name of Business

Physical Business Address

Mailing Address (if different from physical address)

Business Phone

Business Fax

Web site

Business Owner(s) Name(s)

Address of Property to be Improved

Phone

Application being submitted by

Phone

E-mail

Project Information

Please describe scope of project. Attach quote, photos or other information as appropriate. (Please attach additional sheets as required).

Est. Project Start Date: _____

Est. Project Completion Date: _____

Budget

Total Project Cost:

\$ _____

Dollar Amount Requested:

\$ _____

(Please see attached Guidelines)

Authorization

UR District Manager

District Board President

Date Awarded

URA Resoution 2004-005

April 27, 2004

Page 3 of 3 with Exhibit A included

Council Meeting Date: 04.27.04

New Business

TO: Urban Renewal Agency Board of Directors

FROM: Chris Wiley, District Administrator

SUBJECT: URA Resolution 2004-006

ISSUE: Since the Urban Renewal Agency hired Jim Patterson, we need to adopt a personnel management program for the URA.

BACKGROUND: The attached Resolution is self-explanatory.

RECOMMENDATIONS: Motion to Approve URA Resolution 2004-006.

1 Attachment:
Resolution 2004-006

URA Resolution 2004-006

**A RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE CITY OF SHERWOOD PERSONNEL
RULES FOR URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY EMPLOYEES**

WHEREAS, the Urban Renewal Agency hired Mr. Jim Patterson as its first dedicated, full-time employee in March 2004 to serve as the Urban Renewal District Manager; and,

WHEREAS, a personnel management program is required by law; and

WHEREAS, the City of Sherwood has a proven personnel management program which would serve equally as well for the Urban Renewal District Agency;

NOW THEREFORE THE URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY RESOLVES AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. The City of Sherwood personnel management program is hereby adopted for use by the Urban Renewal Agency with the exception of the Salary Schedule which will be treated as a separate entity.

Section 2. This Resolution shall be effective upon its approval and adoption.

Duly passed by Urban Renewal Agency this 27th day of April, 2004.

Mark O. Cottle, Board Chair

Attest:

C.L. Wiley, District Recorder

Approved Minutes

**URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY BOARD OF DIRECTORS
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES**

CITY OF SHERWOOD POLICE FACILITY
20495 SW BORCHERS ROAD
SHERWOOD, OR 97140

TUESDAY, April 27, 2004

- 1. Call to Order:** Chair Cottle called the meeting to order at 8:47 p.m.
- 2. Roll Call:** Chair Cottle, Co-Chair Mays, Mr. Durrell, Mr. Fox, Mr. Grant, Mr. Heironimus and Mr. Weislogel
- 3. Consent Agenda**
 - A. Approve Minutes from the March 23, 2004 URA Board Meeting

UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED BY ALL MEMBERS PRESENT
- 4. New Business**
 - A. **URA Resolution 2004-005 Blight Removal and Rebuild Grant Program** (District Manager Jim Patterson).

MOTION: From Co-chair Mays, seconded by Dennis Durrell, to approve Resolution 2004-005. **UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED BY ALL MEMBERS PRESENT**
 - B. **URA Resolution 2004-006 adopting the City of Sherwood Personnel Rules for Urban Renewal Agency Employees** (District Manager Jim Patterson) This item was pulled from the agenda.
- 5. Adjourn:** Chair Cottle adjourned the meeting at 8:59 p.m.