

**CITY OF SILVERTON
URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY MINUTES**

Silverton High School Library and Zoom Web Conference Platform

March 21, 2022 6:30 p.m.

I. OPENING CEREMONIES – Call to Order, Pledge of Allegiance & Roll Call

Mayor Palmer called the meeting to order at 6:34 p.m. The City Council and staff were present both in person and through the virtual meeting platform Zoom. Mayor Palmer explained this meeting is being held in a hybrid format, pursuant to House Bill 2560, and City of Silverton Resolution 22-06.

| Present | Absent | |
|----------------|---------------|------------------------------------|
| X | _____ | Mayor Kyle Palmer |
| X | _____ | Council President Jason Freilinger |
| X | _____ | Jim Sears |
| X | _____ | Jess Miller |
| X | _____ | Dana Smith |
| _____ | X | Elvi Cuellar Sutton |
| X | _____ | Crystal Neideigh |

Staff Present:

City Manager, Ron Chandler; Community Development Director, Jason Gottgetreu, Public Works Director, Travis Sperle; Chief of Police, Jim Anglemier; City Engineer, Bart Stepp; Assistant to the City Manager/City Clerk, Traci Nichols.

II. DISCUSSION ITEMS

2.1 – Review of Potential Projects for Fiscal Year 2022-2023 and Determine Steps for Prioritizing Future Projects

City Manager Ron Chandler began the discussion. One of the Council goals was to appropriately use the Urban Renewal Agency resources and capabilities. That goal included: assess how URA funds can best be spent to improve downtown core, and commit to utilizing the URA funds in accordance with these objectives. Tonight’s meeting is to establish some direction on where to use the URA funds, and how to appropriately plan for the future. In the Silverton URA summary of projects, \$12.7 million dollars was available to use in the urban renewal district, in different categories. \$6,847,042 million dollars is obligated-\$1,651,575 has been approved for the Civic Center construction. This leaves revenues of \$5,852,958. The areas this can be spent in are: streets, streetscapes, curbs (\$1,650,365), rehab and conservation (\$97,560), redevelopment through new construction (\$6,914), undergrounding of utilities (\$1,440,945), parks and open space (\$317,711), public buildings and facilities (\$0), pedestrian and bicycle improvements (\$956,235), Gateway projects (\$538,683), public utilities (\$485,143), administration of Urban Renewal District (\$359,402). This directs us on where the funds are to be spent. In order to spend monies differently than currently allocated, the Plan would have to be amended. Does Council want to do something that is central to a certain area, like the Downtown Core? Does Council want to try and look to these funds to develop 1 or 2 projects where the URA funds could be used? Do we want to look to potentially utilizing these funds when projects, ideas and requests come up?

Councilor Smith said she wasn't a fan of piecemeal projects, but if we're talking about streetscapes, streets, curbs, pedestrian facilities-those are good fill-ins, if it's needed. She had questions on undergrounding utilities – in her mind, that isn't going to happen due to cost and complexity (through the Downtown). She said there are already underground utilities that are sorely in need of replacement, due to advanced age. The Downtown Core doesn't have adequate storm water systems-maybe underground utilities could fall into that category? She would be in favor of using some of the funds to upgrade the overdo water and sanitary lines in the Downtown Core. She was unsure as to why we would use URA funds for parks infrastructures, when we have park SDC funds waiting to be used. She said she'd asked in the past that an overall plan be addressed for the [skate park] property, before doing a large infrastructure project. There may be other uses there that would appropriately be included in the lighting plan.

Councilor Freilinger sits on the SURAC, and he stated a big part of what was initially planned for in the URA was Downtown infrastructure. He said that money had been spent on private projects, but little had been done downtown as far as utility infrastructure. For him, he sees all these funds that haven't yet been used, and feels obligated to protect projects from nickel and diming the funds before they could be used for a downtown project. He agrees with Councilor Smith's assessment that the City won't be undergrounding utilities. He would like to see the entire fund used for a Downtown infrastructure project. He said that some of the underspent funds could be associated with that. The individual funds were meant to be part of the Downtown. He doesn't know why we would spend more on Gateway projects at present. When it comes to pedestrian and bike improvements, he hears many requests for those. He feels we should be looking to the URA [funds] to do some of that. He would like the City to explore looking into creating a new category strictly for the Downtown Core utility improvement, before spending all the money on the other categories.

Councilor Sears asked about maintenance – can the money be used for maintenance? He didn't think it could be – he thought it was for building improvements or enhancements. His other concern is-if we lump these together-it wasn't the original intent. That's why the items were split out-to be able to disperse the different kinds of projects.

Community Development Director Jason Gottgetreu spoke on the subject, indicating that the formation of the separate categories was likely for the purpose of multi-disciplinary projects—projects that would have elements from the various different funds that could be arranged together.

Councilor Freilinger said he wanted to see things one way or the other – but he wanted to protect some of these funds for the Downtown Core. He couldn't think of a project where we have spent funds on public infrastructure – it keeps getting pulled off into other areas.

Councilor Smith said she didn't know if you'd call a wholesale replacement of a section of infrastructure 'maintenance', but that is probably what is needed in some areas (such as: along Main Street – a project that had been considered in 2010). She knows the intent of this isn't to direct [funds] toward maintenance, but wonders if something like this is considered maintenance.

CDD Gottgetreu read sections of the Plan for clarification. Councilor Smith said the term 'improvements' would be better for what she has in mind [for the Downtown Core].

Mayor Palmer spoke on the subject, saying he wasn't against the concept – and doesn't feel like all the money was designed for the Downtown Core. He said the money was placed in the different funds in the hopes funds would be used in those areas. He said he has always been in favor of spending this money, and we have been sitting on it for a *long* time. He said that if it's a Downtown project-let's start talking about it. If it's a Gateways project-which seems to have a lot of money-let's talk about those. A lot of this money would go in to the Downtown, but there are other things that could be done as well. He doesn't recall a time when we've borrowed from the Urban Renewal District.

Councilor Sears asked for some clarification. He said that in the Urban Renewal Agency Plan, it talks about streets, curbs and sidewalk improvements. The Plan refers to "projects to be undertaken", and he wonders how binding that is. Do we need to do those projects? He said the verbiage isn't as strong in other areas of the Plan as it is in the "projects to be undertaken" section.

CDD Gottgetreu provided some insight, indicating that he took that language as the guide on the potential projects, and the URA and/or Council can go through the amendment process, which has been done a couple of times. If there is a project outside those listed, going through the amendment process is the cleanest way to handle it.

Councilor Sears said he was unclear whether we had spent any money on the streets [included under the “projects to be undertaken” heading in the URA Plan]. He stated he understood the amendment process, but wondered if we were going to include any other streets, would we have to go back and amend the plan? He said that ‘potential projects’ language doesn’t really tie anything down, meaning the work will be done. He takes that as a suggestion, unlike the other language that says it will be undertaken.

CDD Gottgetreu said he agreed that if other streetscape projects were added to the list, the amendment process should be undertaken (to add those to the list).

Councilor Freilinger said he believes we already had a presentation on what the Advisory Committee (SURAC) had recommended when we went through Goal Setting. He said the Advisory Committee recommended a \$4,000,000 price tag to go toward the Downtown area. The SURAC also felt that the URA [funds] needed to be utilized for pedestrian and bike improvements, as well as park improvements. A large part of that park and open space funding has already gone to where the Senior Center is: the skate park, and the dog park. He said the money is drying up fast, and he’s not excited at all about using the URA funds for the Civic Center park. He would like to see us do more for bikes, trails, and open spaces that will more readily be used. We have talked about the west side of Silver Creek as part of our Master Plan, and using some of these funds for that. He feels we are underutilizing URA.

Mayor Palmer asked Councilor Freilinger if he had any ideas for parks to use these funds on. Councilor Freilinger said the Advisory Committee had talked about the southwest side trails, and the All Abilities project (which is being proposed at the April 4th City Council meeting). The All Abilities project would be for people on the spectrum, visually impaired, and mobility impaired. Silverton doesn’t have that type of playground facility.

Mayor Palmer said he thought we had talked about Pettit trails, and thought that was part of Urban Renewal.

CDD Gottgetreu wanted to make sure the Agency kept in mind the fact that we only have a parks improvement SDC fund, where most of our utilities have both reimbursement and improvement SDCs. The parks improvement SDCs have different categories in our Master Plan. If there’s a deficit in our park facilities, those aren’t 100% eligible for improvement SDCs (they’re about 30% eligible, so there has to be other funding sources).

City Manager Ron Chandler said that he perceived the general direction from the Agency was: Don’t allow URA funding to be piecemealed. Focus on downtown. Have staff bring potential projects (that focused on Downtown), and ideas including utility upgrades and improvements, plan projects that associate with those categories.

Mayor Palmer brought up the skate park lighting – if we are going to be putting light around the skate park, it’s preferable to design that with other things in mind. He thinks that would be logical to put lighting around the park, the thought is we would be adding to that circuit sometime in the future.

CM Chandler stated that one of the things we didn’t talk about in our capital improvement planning was the parks. One of the discussions staff was going to bring forward was smaller park projects, but we could easily incorporate that [lighting in the skate park] discussion into the overall plan.

III. ADJOURNMENT

Councilor Freilinger made a motion to adjourn the Urban Renewal Agency, and Mayor Palmer adjourned the meeting at 7:15pm.

Respectfully submitted by:

/s/Traci Nichols, Assistant to the City Manager/City Clerk

**SILVERTON URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY STAFF REPORT
TO THE HONORABLE URA CHAIR AND BOARD MEMBERS**

| | | |
|---|-------------------------|--------------------------|
|  | Agenda Item No.: | Topic: |
| | 3.1 | All Ability Park Feature |
| | Agenda Type: | |
| | Discussion/Action | |
| Meeting Date: | | |
| April 18, 2022 | | |
| Prepared by: | Reviewed by: | Approved by: |
| Ron Chandler | Ron Chandler | Ron Chandler |

Recommendation:

The intent of this agenda item is to receive direction from the Urban Renewal Agency (URA) Board pertaining to an All Ability park feature at Old Mill Park.

Background:

The City Council heard a recommendation from the Rotary Club of Silverton to construct an All Ability park feature at Old Mill Park. In as much as this improvement is within the Urban Renewal District, the City Council referred it to the URA.

The following is a summary of the status and completed projects for the URA.

| Silverton Urban Renewal Summary of Projects | | | | |
|--|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------|
| | Total | Spent/Obligated | Unspent | % Spent |
| Streetscape, Streets and Curbs | \$2,401,575 | \$751,210 | \$1,650,365 | 31.3% |
| Rehabilitation and Conservation | \$960,630 | \$863,070 | \$97,560 | 89.8% |
| Redevelopment Through New Construction | \$1,056,693 | \$1,049,779 | \$6,914 | 99.3% |
| Undergrounding of Utilities | \$1,440,945 | \$0 | \$1,440,945 | 0.0% |
| Parks & Open Space | \$1,921,260 | \$1,603,549 | \$317,711 | 83.5% |
| Public Buildings and Facilities | \$2,401,575 | \$2,401,575 | \$0 | 100.0% |
| Pedestrian & Bike improvements | \$960,630 | \$4,395 | \$956,235 | 0.5% |
| Gateway Projects | \$576,378 | \$37,695 | \$538,683 | 6.5% |
| Public Utilities | \$500,000 | \$14,857 | \$485,143 | 3.0% |
| Administration | \$480,314 | \$120,912 | \$359,402 | 25.2% |
| Totals | \$12,700,000 | \$6,847,042 | \$5,852,958 | 53.9% |

Other Parks and Open Space projects that have been discussed and are eligible for Urban Renewal funding include the following.

- Eugene Field Park

**SILVERTON URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY STAFF REPORT
TO THE HONORABLE URA CHAIR AND BOARD MEMBERS**

| Budget Impact | Fiscal Year | Funding Source |
|----------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| None | 2021-2022 | General Fund |

Attachments: