MINUTES
City of Keizer
River Road Redevelopment Board
Keizer City Hall Library
Wednesday, October 25, 1995

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Smith at 7:05 p.m.

Chairman Smith introduced new member, Velma Tepper.

2. ROLL CALL

The following members were present: Tim Smith, Manny Martinez, Shannon Blake-Thiess, Donald Porter, and Velma Tepper. Stan Compton arrived at 7:20 p.m.

Also present were: Council Liaison Carl Beach, Community Development Director John Morgan, and Recording Secretary Nona Oxe'.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

It was moved by Ms. Blake-Thiess that the minutes of September 27, 1995 be approved. The motion was seconded by Mr. Porter and carried, all present voting aye.

4. APPEARANCE OF INTERESTED CITIZENS

No one came forward to present any issues to the Board.

5. PROJECT UPDATES

Development Activity

Mr. Morgan reported that it now appears that building permits for all types of development will set a record this year. Commercial activity remains very heavy. He called attention to the remodel and new construction project at the old Skippers location, and noted that the owners like the idea of closing the driveway at Sunset.

River Road Redevelopment Project

Undergrounding Project

Mr. Morgan reported that as of this morning crews are about 400 feet short of where they wanted to be at this time. It appears, however, that they will meet the target of having Chemawa Road done by January 1. He noted that most of the vaults are in place along River Road and they have begun laying conduit.

Banners

Neither Mr. Morgan nor Ms. Blake-Thiess had anything to report. Mr. Morgan noted that the City Manager will be taking the staff lead on the project.

Gateway

Mr. Morgan advised that due to the pursuit of more urgent issues, the gateway project had been deferred. He noted, however, that the new owners of the Staats Lake project expressed interest in working with the City on some kind of gateway at the corner of the Staats Lake property.

Sign Grants

Mr. Morgan reported that nine grants have been approved through the Urban Renewal Agency, and a couple more are pending.

Cherry Avenue Design Plan

Mr. Morgan reported that a staff meeting was held last week with the consultants to work out some of the details. Mr. Spencer will be back in January with the draft material for the Cherry Avenue corridor. He will be focusing on some of the design elements around the Bi-Mart center. It was Mr. Morgan's hope that before January the property owners could be brought together to discuss some of the issues.

Mr. Morgan noted that Peterson Engineering is currently working on some options to the design of Iris Lane and the parking lot.

Chemawa Activity Center Plan

Mr. Morgan advised that the Plan is currently under debate by the Planning Commission. A public hearing was held two weeks ago, and continued to next Wednesday, November 1. The Planning Commission will consider draft material at that meeting, and will continue the work at their regular meeting on November 8. The draft Plan will then go on to the Council, anticipating adoption of the Plan around the first of next year.

In looking at the correlation between the Chemawa Activity Center Plan and the River Road corridor, Mr. Morgan explained that financing for the activity center might best be done through a renewal district, which would mean running two renewal districts, possibly competing for available dollars. Also, when considering the proposed mix of uses for the activity center, the question arises of whether to allow businesses that might compete with River Road, and if so, to what degree. Mr. Morgan recounted that the big recommendation is for the hotel, conference, restaurant facility. He noted that the question then becomes, how much more square footage of retail space is allowed in the area, and of what nature?

6. DISCUSSION

Because a number of people in the audience wished to participate in the discussion of agenda item 6.2, the Property Improvement Program, Mr. Smith announced that it would be taken out of order and considered at this time.

6.2 Property Improvement Program

Mr. Morgan recalled that the FY 95-96 Urban Renewal budget includes a $90,000 line item for the Property Improvement Program. He explained that the purpose of the program is to provide financial assistance to property owners along River Road for frontage improvements. He pointed out that a review process has not yet been developed, and noted the need to develop a program design for recommendation to the Renewal Agency Board so that upon their approval staff can begin advertising and implementing the program.

Mr. Morgan called attention to three cases where the program might be applied: one at the Skippers remodel location; a second at the Town & Country Bowl; and the third at the St. Edward's Church location.

For the Skippers location, Mr. Morgan pointed out that the driveway program is already in place which would allow up to $1,200 to close an unneeded driveway. Whether or not renewal money might be used to help with the landscaping for the balance of the property remained a question to be answered.

Mr. Morgan pointed out that the bigger question is whether or not the Renewal Agency should help where there is new construction, or only with existing properties. As an example, Mr. Morgan noted that the Town & Country Bowl is currently working on a design initially with respect to their signage, but now also adding landscaping in the parking lot across the frontage. He noted that historically the property improvement program was intended for such cases.

Mr. Morgan called attention to the third potential application, the St. Edward's Church location. He noted that the possible application of the program did not come as a request from the church, but from City staff in response to the undergrounding project currently underway. He explained that the project presents an opportunity to do some frontage improvements consistent with the recommendations for River Road, and he questioned to what degree the Board felt the City should get involved.

Mr. Morgan suggested that before getting into the details of the St. Edward's proposal, he would like the Board's thoughts with regard to the property improvement program in general. He noted that he will be asking Charlie Kupper to craft, based on his experience with other jurisdictions and input received from R3B, a program design for R3B's consideration, hopefully at next month's meeting. Mr. Morgan indicated that he would like suggestions as to the types of improvements the Board would like to see funded.

Mr. Porter felt that the program should be designed to be consistent for each project.

Mr. Smith pointed out that in the more than six years that he had been involved in the urban renewal process, an issue always talked about was taking the opportunities to close unneeded driveways and consolidate driveways between neighboring properties. It was felt that the driveway closures and consolidations would help enhance traffic flow on River Road and improve ingress and egress to and from the properties. He noted that with the undergrounding now taking place at the St. Edward's Church, it represented one of those opportunities.

(Mr. Compton arrived and took his seat at the table.)

Mr. Smith expressed his concern that looking to the private sector not only to agree to the recommended improvements, but also to foot the bill, would not get the City very far in attaining the goals for River Road. He felt that urban renewal would need to look toward spending the dollars to make those improvements for the benefit of all of the City. He pointed out the benefits to the entire city that would be achieved by closing and consolidating driveways and adding landscaping to enhance and beautify River Road. He cited as an example the Town & Country Bowl, and noted that if the Commission were to recommend funding some of the improvements, it would need to decide whether it would be by way of grant or low-interest/no-interest loan funding.

Mr. Smith also noted that as a developer, when buying and redeveloping a piece of property he expects to pay for required improvements. He emphasized the need to well define what is required to make sure that a developer fits any new development into the guidelines, at his expense. In the case of a current private business owner being asked by the City to participate, Mr. Smith felt urban renewal dollars should accompany the request.

Councilor Beach felt that to avoid inequality, R3B might best be served by defining the policy rather than taking projects one at a time.

Mr. Martinez asked if most of the property owners on River Road would be receptive to driveway closure. Mr. Smith surmised that when first asked, the answer would be negative. Using the St.

Edward's Church location as an example, Mr. Smith explained how consolidation of two driveways right next to each other would benefit the traffic flow. He emphasized the importance of demonstrating the benefits when approaching a property owner.

Mr. Morgan pointed out how closing a driveway at the former Skippers location will benefit the development by increasing parking area.

Mr. Porter felt that the City should be involved in an expense not initiated by a property owner, but by the City. He was concerned, however, about the limited amount of money available and felt that all the primary projects should be looked at before deciding where to spend the urban renewal dollars.

Ms. Blake-Thiess felt that the $90,000 the City had to work with would not be enough to pay for each closure that may be needed. She emphasized the need to develop criteria for the use of the funds.

For clarification, Mr. Morgan pointed out that $90,000 is budgeted for the property improvement program, and in addition $25,000 is specifically targeted for driveways, for a total of $115,000. He confirmed that the intended use for the $90,000 was for landscaping, building facades, etc.

Mr. Porter asked if Mr. Morgan could estimate the number of potential projects.

Mr. Morgan could not estimate how many businesses might wish to participate in the program once it is promoted. He noted that more sign grant requests were received than had been expected. He felt that the potential existed for 20 projects, and gave examples of properties that might want help in making improvements. He pointed out that the current grant is for this fiscal year; there might be more money available next year.

Mr. Morgan acknowledged that he would do his best to bring back a program design next month, but noted the immediate need to make a determination with regard to the St. Edward's Church location.

Mr. Morgan explained that the PGE undergrounding project involves removal and replacement of the sidewalks on the west side of River Road beginning at the First Interstate Bank location and continuing northerly. Staff identified properties where the sidewalk could be moved back and a planting strip created, as is recommended for River Road. Mr. Morgan pointed out that because of the size of the frontage, the St. Edward's Church seemed the first and most obvious for the improvement. Realizing the likelihood of a signal at Claggett within the next twelve to eighteen months, and how the signal location would conflict with the existing location of the southern driveway, it was felt that something must be done with the driveway. PGE's removal of the existing sidewalk created an opportunity to move the driveway prior to installation of the new sidewalk. Mr. Morgan noted that it was then that staff realized the possibility of consolidating the northern driveway with the driveway on the property to the north.

Mr. Morgan advised that Father Mike Hemming from St. Edward's Church, and representatives from the Parish and the Archdiocese were present to speak to the issue. He noted that at a meeting with church representatives last week several issues and questions were raised. The main question being "Who's paying for all of this?" The Board is being asked to consider to what degree the Renewal Agency would want to bear costs, and what costs should be borne by the church.

Mr. Morgan noted that Mayor Koho is calling a special Urban Renewal Agency meeting for Monday night to discuss the proposed improvements. Responding to the issues raised by the Church, and in working with the City engineers, Mr. Morgan today put together a staff report and a more refined design for submittal to the Urban Renewal Agency, outlining potential funding options. He distributed copies of the report for Board members to use as a working document to development recommendations for submittal at Monday night's Agency meeting.

Mr. Morgan reviewed the options outlined in the staff report and asked that R3B consider each corresponding question and, by motion, make a recommendation regarding each one for submittal to the Renewal Agency. He noted that although the staff report deals with the issues at the St. Edward's Church, some of the policy decision relative to St. Edward's could also apply to some other properties.

Referring to the refined drawing, Mr. Morgan pointed out three specific proposals for the St. Edward's property: the sidewalk relocation, the southern driveway relocation, and the northern driveway consolidation. Of the three, staff considered the northern driveway consolidation the least important.

For Project One, Mr. Morgan pointed out the proposed sidewalk configuration along the frontage of the St. Edward's property. He noted that there is adequate right-of-way to move the sidewalk within the public right-of-way north of the Claggett Street centerline. South of the line additional right-of-way or a sidewalk easement would be required. Mr. Morgan explained that moving the sidewalk is more expensive than replacing it in its existing location since with the relocation the curb will need to be replaced. Plus, the planting strip needs to be landscaped with ground cover and trees.

Mr. Morgan reviewed two options and cost estimates for replacing the sidewalk. The cost estimate for option one, to carry out existing construction without any changes, is $6,000. The cost estimate for option two, to move the sidewalk creating a 5 foot planting strip with landscaping, is $15,000.

For Project Two, Mr. Morgan pointed out the proposed southern driveway relocation and realignment with Claggett Street. The proposal anticipates a signal at Claggett Street, and thus a signalized driveway serving the church property. Mr. Morgan stated that since the proposed realigned driveway is on church private property, the question is to what degree does the Renewal Agency bear responsibility for the costs.

Mr. Morgan reviewed the two options and cost estimates to realign the driveway. The estimated cost for option one, to construct the driveway with a curb return, including internal realignment, is $20,000. The cost estimate for option two, to construct the driveway with a drop-curb, including internal realignment is $15,600. Mr. Morgan explained the difference between a curb return and a drop-curb, and noted that the higher estimate represents higher construction requirements and the need for storm drainage. Mr. Morgan noted that approximately $13,000 of the cost, regardless of which option is chosen, is for improvements on the St. Edward's property to realign the drive to meet the new driveway and to remove the old drive and restore the site with top soil.

Mr. Morgan reviewed the proposal for Project Three, the northern driveway consolidation, and pointed out how it would improve the flow of traffic to and from the properties. The cost estimate to consolidate the northern driveway with the driveway on property to the north including creating a three-lane section is $27,750, considerably higher than was anticipated. Because of the high cost, Mr. Morgan considered this project a lesser priority than the other two.

Mr. Smith stressed the need Citywide to get rid of some of the curb cuts. However, he also was shocked at the $27,750 cost estimate.

Mr. Morgan noted that the grand total to do all three projects is estimated at between $52,350 and $57,550 depending on the southern driveway design.

Mr. Porter wondered how many other projects of this magnitude would be vying for the renewal money. Mr. Morgan could see no other frontage improvement project of this size that R3B might get involved in.

Mr. Porter recalled the City's participation in improvements at the Senior Center on Cherry Avenue. He felt that this was a similar situation.

Mr. Compton felt that the realignment of the driveway at Claggett Street would present an advantage for the church in moving traffic to and from their property. He also felt that the northern driveway consolidation would be a plus for the church congregation, the apartments, and the office complex. He agreed that using some renewal money would be appropriate, but because the improvements would enhance all of the properties, he felt there should be cost sharing amongst all the players.

From a practical standpoint, Mr. Smith felt that the owners of the apartment complex, the office building, and the church would want to know the rate of return for putting money into the project. It was his feeling that the situation would be the same with all the business owners along River Road when approached to make frontage improvements.

Discussion followed regarding the benefits of the three projects to both the City and the property owners, and the degree of importance they held with respect to the overall plan for River Road. Mr. Morgan responded to questions about the City's access requirements.

Mr. Morgan described other opportunities for sidewalk relocation along River Road, but noted that none of the others involved driveway relocation and consolidation issues. In addition to the $90,000 Property Improvement Program funds, funding for the St. Edward's improvement as well as future similar projects could come from a $500,000 surplus in the Underground project funds.

Mr. Morgan advised that staff had met with the St. Edward's Parish Council and the property manager for the Archdiocese of Portland to discuss the proposals. He summarized concerns expressed by them at the meeting regarding the responsibility for the costs of installation of improvements, and maintenance of the planting strip.

Mr. Morgan called attention to seven questions in the staff report, each dealing with a specific aspect of the proposed improvements. He requested that the Board respond to each by motion, for recommendation to the Urban Renewal Agency.

Chairman Smith asked for input from representatives of the St. Edward's Church.

Father Hemming advised that the church established its budget last July and allocated $25,000 to various structures and projects on the church property, one being a new roof. He indicated that he would not now relish having a fund drive, asking church members to pay for this additional project. He only became aware of the proposal about a month ago, and there was no way to include it in this year's budget.

Ed Bolf, a member of the St. Edward's Parish Council, asked how the offset on the St. Edward's property line was identified. Mr. Morgan explained that it came from survey data and the assessors records, and also is reflected in the right-of-way line for River Road. He indicated that he would be happy to have the City Engineer re-verify the records.

Mr. Bolf questioned the proposed configuration for the south driveway and signal. Mr. Morgan acknowledged that other configurations had been considered, however, the general conclusion was that the proposed alignment was the most logical financially and practically, and the most sound from an engineering standpoint.

Mr. Porter pointed out the advantage of the improved access to River Road should the church ever wish to develop their property to the west of the church. Discussion followed regarding other driveway possibilities.

Ms. Delia Wilson, property manager with the Archdiocese, indicated that she would hate to see the discussion focus on how a signal might benefit the back property. She noted that there are no plans to sell or develop the property. She urged that the Board not base any decision on speculating how the church would benefit for a portion of the property.

Ms. Wilson indicated the church's support for the plans for urban renewal and acknowledged the benefits to the community. With regard to the sidewalk placement and planting strip, Ms. Wilson relayed the Parish's willingness to work with the city. She noted that the Parish would be giving up a portion of its property, and would experience some inconvenience, but acknowledged that realigning the driveway with Claggett could be perceived to have some benefit to the Parish. However, she saw the signalization as being motivated by development across the street. In summarizing, Ms. Wilson indicated the church's willingness to cooperate, and offered its good neighbor support, but she wished to make it clear that the church was not in a position to contribute financially.

With respect to the south driveway, Ms. Wilson indicated that rather than loosing the driveway altogether because of the church's inability to participate in funding, the City consider designating it right-in and right-out only. For the northerly driveway, the Church had no problem with the current configuration

In conclusion, Ms. Wilson respectfully requested that the Board consider making a recommendation for full funding of the proposals.

Ms. Blake-Thiess asked if the church through its governing structure had access to a loan program. Ms. Wilson answered that the Archdiocese has a loan program, with established criteria.

A lengthy discussion followed regarding the objectives of the property improvement program and the benefits of the various proposals to the church and the benefits to the City. Mr. Morgan concurred with the church that none of the proposed improvements represent a financial advantage to the church.

Mr. Smith emphasized the need for the City to put up the money for improvements to existing properties in order to meet the property improvement program goals. He stressed that developers are aware that they will be responsible for those costs where there is new development.

Mr. Morgan agreed, and pointed out that the current draft of the Commercial/Mixed Use Zone under review by the Planning Commission requires sidewalks to be moved to create a planting strip, with new development or redevelopment.

In looking at the alternatives for improvements to the southern driveway, Ms. Blake-Thiess noted that the church has no plans to develop any portion of their property for the next three to five years.

She, therefore, saw no reason for the City to spend an additional $5,000+ to put in a return curb instead of a drop-curb.

Ms. Blake-Thiess also indicated that she would like to see continuity with respect to the sidewalks along River Road. She felt that it would be more logical to look at sidewalk relocation in terms of blocks, not properties.

Mr. Morgan acknowledged that the Planning Commission will be looking at a threshold for requiring sidewalk relocation. He pointed out opportunities to do it for new development, and agreed that it will likely result in a meandering sidewalk over the length of River Road.

Mr. Smith pointed out that the philosophy is to do sidewalk relocation and planting strips in as many places as is feasible or practical. He and Mr. Morgan noted that the church frontage is greater than a city block.

Concern was expressed that the number of potential projects along River Road was unknown, and that the Board was being asked to make recommendations for use of the limited funds without having a total picture.

Mr. Morgan explained that he was asking the Board to make a decision on the church tonight because construction on the undergrounding project was now underway. He indicated that he and the engineers would look at the entire corridor and develop some cost estimates prior to the November meeting.

Mr. Smith asked the Board to pass a motion with respect to each of the seven questions in Mr. Morgan's staff report.

1. Should the southern St. Edward's driveway be relocated to align with Claggett Street as part of and paid for by the Undergrounding project?

> <u>It was moved by Mr. Compton that R3B recommend to the Urban Renewal Agency that the St. Edward's driveway be relocated to align with Claggett Street. The motion was seconded by Mr. Martinez.</u>
>
> Mr. Porter asked who would be responsible for the costs. Mr. Smith pointed out that the project would be paid for from the surplus underground project funds.
>
> Mr. Morgan pointed out that the funding portion of the question is addressed in question number three and could be voted on separately
>
> <u>The motion carried, all present voting aye.</u>

2. If so, should the design involve a drop-curb or a curb-return driveway?

It was moved by Mr. Compton that R3B recommend to the Urban Renewal Agency that the design involve a drop-curb driveway. The motion was seconded by Ms. Blake-Thiess.

Ms. Blake-Thiess asked if her understanding was correct that of the $15,600 total cost, $13,000 represented improvements on the St. Edward's property; and the method of funding would be addressed in question number three. Mr. Smith answered that she was correct with regard to both issues.

The motion carried, all present voting aye.

3. Should the Agency bear the cost of realigning the internal drive on the St. Edward's property as part of and paid for by the Undergrounding project?

It was moved by Mr. Compton that R3B recommend to the Urban Renewal Agency that the Agency bear the cost of realigning the internal drive (the south driveway) on the St. Edward's property as part of and paid for by the Undergrounding project. The motion was seconded by Mr. Martinez.

Ms. Blake-Thiess felt that funding the $13,000 to realign the driveway on the St. Edward's property using Urban Renewal funds would set a precedent. She pointed out that the Agency did not pick up the total costs for the Salem Area Seniors on the Cherry Avenue project. She felt that the costs should be shared by the Church since they would receive benefit from the driveway.

Mr. Compton asked Mr. Morgan at how many more streets the installation of signals would also necessitate driveway realignment. Mr. Morgan answered that Iris Lane would be the only one. He described arrangements negotiated with the McDonald's Corporation, and confirmed that negotiations were in consideration of a development project, and not similar to this situation.

Mr. Porter pointed out the difference between the Senior's project and this one. He emphasized the benefits to the City by the realignment.

Mr. Smith and Mr. Compton shared a concept of the property improvement program, that for new development the developer would pay for improvements; for existing property where a property owner must make a change to conform with Urban Renewal goals, Urban Renewal should be responsible for the costs. They felt that perhaps the concept should be adopted as a philosophy of R3B for the program.

The motion carried, all present voting aye except Ms. Blake-Thiess who voted no.

4. Should the sidewalk be replaced so that a 5' planting strip is created and landscaped as part of and paid for by the Undergrounding project?

It was moved by Mr. Porter that R3B recommend to the Urban Renewal Agency that the sidewalk be replaced so that a 5' planting strip is created and landscaped as part of and paid for by the Undergrounding project. The motion was seconded by Mr. Martinez.

Ms. Blake-Thiess asked what cost savings would be realized by doing the project at this time. Mr. Smith pointed out that replacing the sidewalk in the current location would cost $6,000. If that were done and then it were to be replaced with a setback sidewalk with a planting strip at sometime in the future, demolition costs would be added to the replacement costs. Mr. Morgan noted, also, that the City is getting a "package price" for the entire undergrounding project, allowing the cost for the sidewalk replacement to come in at a lower price than it would if done as a single project at a later date.

The motion carried, all present voting aye.

5. Should the northern St. Edward's driveway be consolidated with the driveway to the north as part of and paid for by the Undergrounding project?

It was moved by Mr. Compton that R3B recommend to the Urban Renewal Agency that the northern St. Edward's driveway be consolidated with the driveway to the north as part of and paid for by the Undergrounding project. The motion was seconded by Mr. Porter.

Mr. Compton indicated that he had made his motion for the sake of discussion only.

Mr. Smith called attention to his interest as property manager for the properties to the north of the church. He reiterated his advocacy for driveway consolidation along the entirety of River Road, but again indicated his shock at the $27,750 estimated cost for this project, and noted that he would be unable to support the recommendation.

Discussion followed regarding traffic safety issues and the urgency of the project as it relates to other potential projects along the corridor. It was the consensus that although the driveway consolidation would respond to one of the goals for River Road, the cost was not justified in terms of priority.

The motion failed, all present voting no.

6. Should a grant or loan be given to St. Edward's for landscaping the areas around the new driveways?

Noting the current lack of details regarding the type of landscaping desired for the area, and also the lack of a procedure for evaluating and approving grant requests, Mr. Morgan suggested that the Board might not wish, at this time, to respond to this question.

It was moved by Ms. Blake-Thiess that question no. 6 be tabled until more information is available specific to landscaping the areas around the new driveways, and also as to the method for handling landscaping grant or loan requests. The motion was seconded by Mr. Martinez.

Mr. Porter pointed out that unlike other potential grant recipients, St. Edward's Church has congregation members who might be able to assist in landscape installation and maintenance.

Mr. Morgan noted that Mr. Matiskainen, who did the site work and master planning for the church property, had indicated an interest in seeing a plan prior to the church making or responding to any type of proposal.

The motion to table carried, all present voting aye.

7. Should staff pursue sidewalk relocations for other existing developed properties as part of the Undergrounding project and/or as other opportunities arise?

It was moved by Ms. Blake-Thiess that R3B support pursuit of sidewalk relocations for other existing developed properties as part of the Undergrounding project and/or as other opportunities arise. The motion was seconded by Mr. Martinez and carried, all present voting aye.

Mr. Morgan encouraged all R3B members to attend the Urban Renewal Agency meeting Monday night at 6:00 p.m. Mr. Smith indicated that he would be there to support the Board's recommendations.

The Board recessed 9:00 p.m. and reconvened at 9:09 p.m.

6.1 River Road Design Plan II

Due to the late hour and the importance of the issue, Mr. Smith suggested that the discussion of the River road Design Plan II be rescheduled. Mr. Morgan confirmed that the Planning Commission will begin work on the same issues at their November 8 meeting.

After discussion it was the consensus to schedule two meetings to evaluate the remainder of the issues outlined in the matrix. The Board agreed to meet on November 29 and December 6.

7. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND AGENDA INPUT

Mr. Morgan distributed copies of the Final River and Chemawa Center Specific Plan prepared by SRI/Shapiro, Inc.

The next meeting will be held on November 29, at 7:00 p.m.

ADJOURN

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned by Chairman Smith at 9:20 p.m.