Minutes
River Road Redevelopment Board
Keizer City Hall - Library
Wednesday, August 28, 1996

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Compton at 7:09 p.m. **A quorum was not present.**

2. **ROLL CALL**

The following members were present: Stan Compton, June Abbott, and Joe VanMeter. Manny Martinez arrived just after roll call.

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

3. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

There were no corrections to the minutes of the July 31, 1996 meeting.

4 **APPEARANCE OF INTERESTED CITIZENS**

Several people in the audience indicated that they might wish to speak during discussion of specific agenda items.

Because a quorum was not present, Chairman Compton stated that although he would allow the Community Development Director to report on the various agenda items, and would allow members of the audience to comment, no formal action could be taken.

To accommodate members of the audience, Chairman Compton rearranged the agenda.

6. **DISCUSSION**

6.3 Cherry Avenue Design Plan - Cade Avenue

Chairman Compton opened the discussion regarding Cade Avenue to comments from interested Cade Avenue property owners.

FMAGIC

Eric Leadley, 920 Cade Avenue NE, Keizer, stated his conviction that Cade Avenue is not now, and never has been a dedicated street. He explained that he searched the records of the Marion County Assessor, County Clerk, and County Survey Office, and obtained copies of all Cade Avenue property deeds. All information indicates that the street was never dedicated, and property owners on Cade own their properties up to the 20-foot public access. Mr. Leadley and his group were informed by the Survey Office that the access was never a County road. He emphasized that when the City was incorporated in 1982 and took over the County roads, it could not have taken over Cade since it was a private road--never a County road. He felt that if the decision was to proceed with improving Cade, someone should explain to the citizens on the east end of Cade where the other 20 feet of property needed for a 60-foot road would come from.

Mr. Compton asked what information the City had relied upon regarding the street. Mr. Morgan answered that the City commissioned a survey by professional registered surveyors. They provided all the base information that has gone into the design. He noted that the surveyors found corner points, indicating a public street.

Mr. Leadley reiterated that the public access is only 20 feet wide at the east end near Cherry Avenue.

Mr. Morgan acknowledged that if the street project happens, and it's wider than what it is today, there will have to be acquisition of property. He emphasized that property owners would be compensated by the Renewal Agency. Mr. Leadley noted that the majority of the Cade property owners do not want to sell any part of their property to improve the street. He stressed that they wish to leave the street as it is. He wondered how the City could do the improvement over their objections. Mr. Morgan answered that it could be done by condemnation. Mr. VanMeter interjected that R3B, as a committee, hasn't pushed for such an action. He felt that if the people don't want the street improved, there were other places where the money could be spent.

Ruby Cook, 800 Cade Avenue NE, Keizer, stated that she did not object to the street being improved. However, she strongly objected to a sidewalk within 2 feet of her bedroom, as the improvement appeared on the plans she was shown.

Nikki White, 920 Cade Avenue NE, Keizer, stated that the majority of the property owners didn't want to see anything done to the street. She reiterated the points made by Mr. Leadley.

Mr. VanMeter explained that R3B had looked at this as an opportunity to assist the residents on Cade in bettering their neighborhood by improving the street. He agreed that if Cade were truly not a dedicated street, it might present a problem.

Les Cook, 800 Cade Avenue NE, Keizer, indicated that in looking at the plans and drawings, if the scale was correct in one of the drawings, his lot would be cut from 136 feet down to 50 feet.

Mr. Compton called attention to a letter to the Mayor from Mr. and Mrs. J. P. Weigel at 3601 Cherry Avenue NE, Keizer. (Copies of the letter were distributed in the agenda packets.) The letter requested that Cade be paved as is 20-feet wide, without curbs and sidewalks, and making a cul-de-sac on the west end.

Mr. Compton asked if the neighbors agreed with the idea of paving only. Ms. White wished to have it remain as it is. Mrs. Cook did not object to paving as long as it involved no more than 20 feet of right-of-way. She noted that most of the neighbors objected to paving, fearing that once the City "gets in" and has a dedicated street, the door would be open to widen to 60 feet.

Mr. Morgan responded to questions about the proposed right-of-way. He pointed out that the street would never be 60 feet wide; the maximum width would be 30 feet, curb to curb. He noted that the maximum width is depicted on the drawing provided to the residents. The total improvement area is 41 feet; 30 feet curb to curb, plus the curbs and sidewalks. It could be less with different options.

Mr. Compton asked about the number of residences on Cade, how many were owner-occupied, and what number of residents preferred to see Cade remain as it is. The neighbors answered that there are 14 residences. Eleven of the 14 are owner-occupied. Eight want the street to remain as it is; the other three would like to have it paved, as is. However, they all want the trees saved, which would make paving impossible. One of the property owners pointed out that the owner of the adjacent Northwest apartments had indicated that they had abandoned plans for a sidewalk, and would go along with the citizens on Cade to have the street remain as it is.

Mr. Morgan gave a brief summary of the reasoning behind the recommendation for improvements to Cade, and the relationship to the overall redevelopment and transportation planning efforts. He explained potential impacts on property owners, and on the City overall. He described possible options for Cade including leaving it as is, putting a hard surface on the street to improve maintenance efforts, doing real improvements and making Cade a cul-de-sac, and improving and putting Cade through, Cherry Avenue to River Road. He explained the economic benefits of improving the street. He stressed that at this time R3B is looking for input on how to draft the Cherry Avenue Design Plan and where Cade fits in.

Mr. Morgan noted that the Planning Commission has recommended to R3B to do nothing with Cade, and make Plymouth the number 2 priority for street improvements, following Iris Lane. The president of Salem Area Seniors has also asked that Plymouth be made the number 2 priority.

Mr. Morgan gave an overview of what improvements might be completed with the $550,000 in this year's budget. He noted that the money for the second round of the east/west improvements would be available two years from now. He pointed out that R3B's charge is to determine what is best for the community in considering where to invest redevelopment dollars.

A discussion followed on possible traffic impacts, and the likely effect of Cade improvements on land values and property taxes. Mr. VanMeter could not understand why property owners would reject improvements, at no cost to them, that would increase the value of their property.

Mr. Cook pointed out that the biggest contention of the property owners was that they strongly objected to the through traffic to the light. He reiterated that the neighbors fear that once in, the City will decide to expand.

Concluding the discussion, Mr. Compton noted that since a quorum was not present, R3B could take no formal action at this time. He anticipated that since the majority of Cade residents wished to have the street remain as it is, R3B would go along with the Planning Commission recommendation to make Plymouth the number 2 priority and put Cade on the "back burner."

Bob Wright, 871 Cade Avenue, Keizer, part owner of the Northwest apartments, stated that his concerns are the same as the neighbors. He noted that the apartment owners had originally thought about putting in a sidewalk, but had abandoned the idea. They too didn't want to loose the trees. He, however, had understood that the discussion regarding improvements was with regard to forming a local improvement district. With the new information that improvements would be done with urban renewal funds, he felt that it might be looked at differently.

Mr. VanMeter pointed out that formation of a local improvement district might be an option at some time in the distant future. The opportunity for upgrading using urban renewal funding might no longer be available.

Mr. Compton reiterated that the subject will again be discussed at the next R3B meeting by a full quorum, after which a recommendation will be made to the City Council.

Mr. Morgan reminded the members of the audience that a forum will be held on September 18, at which time east/west streets will be discussed in the context of the entire Cherry Avenue project. As a final note, he also reminded them that the property is zoned RM (Residential Multi-family) and the Cherry Avenue improvements will improve the development potential of their properties. Multi-family development of any one property could greatly increase the traffic on the unimproved street. Mr. Morgan suggested that the neighbors at least consider allowing a hard surface on the street.

Some of the Cade Street residents indicated that they might be open to paving the street as it is, with a cul-de-sac at the west end.

The Cade residents participating in the discussion had no further comment, and left the meeting.

The Board briefly discussed the idea of changing priorities. Mr. Morgan pointed out that although the Board could not take formal action, he wished to get a sense of how they felt about moving Cade down on the priority list. He pointed out the need to finalize the plan draft before distributing it to the public prior to the September 18 public workshop. He responded to questions about the amount of work that could be accomplished with this year's budget. He acknowledged that completing Plymouth Avenue would get into the next budget year, however, acquisition and preliminary design could be done in this year's budget.

It was the general feeling of those members present that Plymouth Avenue should be moved to the number 2 priority, and Cade be moved down on the list. Mr. VanMeter emphasized the importance of improving Cade, when the timing is right.

6.4 Amendment to Urban Renewal Plan - Boundary Change

Referring to wall maps, Mr. Morgan pointed out the boundaries of the Chemawa Activity Center. He reviewed the history of efforts to determine appropriate land use and zoning for the area. He noted that on September 16, at a continued public hearing which began in February, the City Council is expected to close the public hearing and act on the document.

Mr. Morgan briefly reviewed the proposed zoning and potential land uses for each area of the activity center. He noted that if adopted on September 16, the zoning will go into effect, making way for development of the property. Mr. Morgan stated that the next step would be to finance the infrastructure. He recalled Council's goal to have a financing plan in place by January 1, 1997.

Mr. Morgan described the four-pronged approach that he had from the beginning envisioned as a way to finance the infrastructure. It included creation of a new urban renewal district. The district would sell bonds to finance the $8 or 9 million worth of infrastructure, with building to begin the Summer of 1998. Repayment would be through a variety of means. Likely, a LID (local improvement district) would pick up a portion of the cost, and would be assessed when the property is sold. Another 25-40% might be covered by systems development charges, paid at the time of building permits. Economic Development Department grants would make up another percentage. The fourth means would be tax increment financing. Mr. Morgan perceived that using the four-pronged approach, the bonds could be retired in two to three years.

However, Mr. Morgan reported that a proposal was made to the City Council which would require possible changes to the Plan and a different approach to the infrastructure financing. He noted that the City was approached by Single A baseball team, proposing that if the City would enter into a partnership to create a stadium, they would move their baseball team to Keizer. (The name of the ball team will be made known in about 10 days.) After checking out the credentials of the people making the proposal and their ability to do what they say, the Council has decided to pursue the project. It was felt that a stadium would add to the character of the community. And baseball, as well as many other stadium activities, would be supported by the surrounding area.

Mr. Morgan noted that the Council has worked quickly to figure out how to achieve the project. The proposal calls for the ball team to build the stadium; the City must provide the land, infrastructure, and parking lot. The total cost to the City would be about $2.6 million. Mr. Morgan pointed out on the map the site concurred in by the Council and the ball team, at the northerly end of the Chemawa Activity Center. He explained that the property is impacted by the BPA right-of-way and the overhead power lines. Although it would be a good fit for a stadium and work nicely for parking under the power lines, the land likely would not have as much marketability as other land at the southerly end.

Mr. Morgan explained that the $2.6 million would pay for the sewer line to the site, the water to the site, buy the land, and put in about 1,500 parking spaces. He noted that the figure was based on a best estimate of sale price on the land. Mr. Morgan perceived that the Council saw this as a way to get sewer and water to the area, thus encouraging redevelopment in accordance with the IBP and CR zones in the activity center area. Also, the stadium would act as a marketable element of the entire business park, much as undergrounding power lines has enhanced the marketability of River Road.

Mr. Morgan pointed out that the ball team plans to move from its current location this year, and wants to play ball at the new stadium by June 1, 1997, making it necessary to "fast-track" the process. Thus, the City is left with the issue of how to finance the $2.6 million investment. He noted that some reimbursement might reduce that figure by up to $.5 million, leaving a net of $2 to 2.2 million.

Mr. Morgan explained that there is not enough time to create a new urban renewal district. He noted that the idea surfaced to amend the River Road Redevelopment District to extend the boundaries out to encompass the area. It can be done in 60 to 90 days. Mr. Morgan acknowledged that the existing financial structure of the River Road renewal district can support the suggested expansion. He distributed copies of a map depicting the proposed boundaries. Mr. Morgan asked for R3B input on the suggested boundary change. He noted that he would forward the comments on to the City Council for their consideration when they consider what boundary to incorporate into the Chemawa Activity Center Plan draft. With regard to expansion of the River Road Redevelopment District, he noted that Council wants R3B to continue in its current advisory board roll.

As such, R3B would have opportunity to comment on the draft plan when it comes out. He reiterated that at this time he was looking for input on the suggested expansion only. He anticipated that R3B would review the Plan at its October meeting, it would go to Council for public hearing in late November, and be adopted around the first of December. If everything comes together, the ball team owners plan to break ground around January 1.

Mr. Morgan explained that an urban renewal district can, by law, be expanded 20 percent. The River Road District could be expanded up to an additional 146.84 acres. He emphasized that by doing the proposed expansion, the River Road district would be precluded from expanding somewhere else. The expanded boundary would be absolute; it could not be removed or moved. Mr. Morgan noted that the proposed area was chosen because it incorporates the site and the area with the maximum potential for high value growth. The area encompasses 142 acres, and therefore doesn't take in areas B, C and D of the draft.

Assuming that urban renewal is approved for the northerly portion of the site, Ms. Abbott wondered what would be expected by developers for the remainder of the acreage within the activity center. Mr. Morgan explained that the entire area is covered by the renewal plan. However, the proposed amendment to the River Road Renewal District covers only area A. Ms. Abbott conceded that once area A is developed, the remainder would follow.

Mr. Morgan pointed out that if the Renewal Agency were to do a separate urban renewal district, it would not be subject to the 20% limit. He noted that there is ample land to do a separate urban renewal district that would encompass the balance of the activity center. Mr. VanMeter felt this would be an opportune time to do a second urban renewal district as well as the expansion.

Mr. Morgan responded to questions and comments about the proposed stadium.

Mr. Martinez voiced concern that a stadium would provide only low-paying jobs, and that the City has no guarantee that a ball team would stay if attendance didn't meet expectations. He again voiced his objection to Council's "fast-track" approach, and the lack of opportunity for public comment.

Mr. Compton felt that with a $5 million investment in a stadium the ball team would likely stay.

Mr. Morgan explained that Council is structuring the public input rather than taking it "shotgun." He emphasized that the team does not want to go public until after Labor Day, the end of their current baseball season. Council will then start getting the input. He anticipated at least four public hearings on the Chemawa Activity Center Plan, Urban Renewal Plan, and site plan itself. For the Urban Renewal Plan amendment, Mr. Morgan proposed sending notice to every utility-bill payer in the City, ensuring opportunity for a wide-range of public comment.

Before receiving any direction from the Board regarding the boundary expansion, Mr. Morgan wished to present one other alternative. He noted that the suggested 142 acres is 4.84 acres short of the allowed 20%, and the development potential in area B might be greater than in part of area A. He pointed out on the map 6.27 acres of land owned by Rich Rawlins at the northwesterly end of area A which could be taken out, allowing 11.11 acres (the capacity left) of area B to be included.

A discussion followed regarding the benefits of including a portion of area B. Mr. Morgan responded to questions about infrastructure improvements within and outside the renewal district boundaries. He also answered questions about the marketability of the property at the northwesterly end of the acreage proposed for exclusion from the renewal district expansion. He emphasized that no property would be hurt by the alternative boundary.

Mr. Martinez called attention to Senate Bill 1. He stated that it deals with the Oregon Youth Authority, and efforts to provide schools. He felt that the area proposed for the stadium would be a tremendous area for a youth group. He questioned the tactics of saying the land was unmarketable, and suggested that there were numerous better uses for the land. Mr. Morgan pointed out that the land was considered not as marketable as some other ground because of the power lines. Mr. VanMeter, an employee of the Oregon Youth Authority, stated that school sites have already been selected.

Joesephine Ditchen, 7332 - 74th Avenue NE, Salem, owner of property at 6350 Radiant Drive, Keizer, noted that the proposal appeared to be for property north of Tepper Lane. She questioned the possibility of her property, south of Tepper, being included. Mr. Morgan answered that at a meeting next week the question of "Does the property layout work or do we need to go further south?" will be discussed. However, it now appeared that Ms. Ditchen would not be approached by the City to sell her property. He noted that Council is suggesting that if the stadium is built, there will be many people looking at buying neighboring properties.

Ms. Ditchen noted the possibility of rock concerts at the stadium, and questioned whether any noise controls would be built into the IBP zone. Mr. Morgan answered that the noise issue is being looked at. Design of the stadium, and the City's noise ordinance are two avenues to control noise.

Jackie Moir, secretary of the Gubser Neighborhood Association, 6745 McLeod Lane NE, Keizer, called attention to a letter from the Neighborhood Association to the City Council, stating concerns about the proposed stadium. (Mr. Morgan made copies for Board members and for the record.) Ms. Moir relayed the neighborhood's concerns about traffic and reduced property values. She noted that the neighborhood association encompasses the entire area being talked about, and emphasized the need for the neighborhood to be included in any formal discussion of the proposal.

Ms. Abbott asked if there were any plans for closing off Tepper Lane. Mr. Morgan answered that he is writing a draft amendment to the activity center plan which would address the possibility of closing off Tepper Lane during major events. Mr. VanMeter pointed out the need to also address the possibility of a wider road than Radiant Drive. Mr. Morgan described the anticipated future layout of Radiant Drive. He noted the likelihood of Radiant remaining as it is for another year or two. As part of traffic management, it would be suggested that police officers direct traffic before and after events.

Mr. Morgan acknowledged that there would be many impacts from the stadium that would need to be discussed during the time for public comment. He reiterated that tonight he merely wanted an indication of the Board's preference with regard to the redevelopment district boundary expansion.

After discussion, with the exception of Mr. Martinez, the Board members present supported extending the River Road Redevelopment District boundary as described in the alternative which would include the 11+ acres in area B.

Mr. Morgan pointed out one additional consideration that will be presented to Council. The $1/thousand lid on taxes will be increased and possibly even doubled. An analysis will be presented to Council.

Mr. VanMeter recalled his earlier statement that the Cherry Avenue project should not be sacrificed to buy a ball field. He did feel, however, that if the stadium project would jump-start the whole Chemawa Activity Center project, something should be done to make it happen. Mr. Morgan envisioned no impact on current projects.

Mr. VanMeter indicated that he would like to start the process for a second urban renewal district at the same time as the expansion. Mr. Morgan indicated that he would look at the possibility with staff.

As a side note, Mr. Morgan pointed out that if the property in area B were included in the renewal district, it could be used to build a gateway at McLeod and Lockhaven.

There were no further comments from the audience. Most of those present for the discussion left the meeting.

5. PROJECT UPDATES

Development Activity

Mr. Morgan reported that the Alliance Church and feed store at River and Chemawa will soon be taken down and replaced with a new, attractive 15,000 SF building. Mr. Morgan was not yet at liberty to name the retail user, but noted they will be an enhancement to the community. He described how the building would be located on the property. He noted that the owner is receptive to the "plaza" idea at the corner. Mr. Morgan noted that the sidewalk and landscape improvements will be constructed along with the building construction saving the Urban Renewal District the money that was granted to Mr. Wittenberg.

The feed store is looking at doing new construction at a site on Cherry Avenue.

Salem Hospital and Salem Clinic are doing a big project at Staats Lake on the NE corner.

Reiland Associates is building a high-end, medium-density housing project plus office space on the SE corner of Staats Lake.

Some interest has been demonstrated in the old senior center building on Cherry Avenue.

Property Improvement Program

There have been no new grant requests.

River Road Redevelopment Project

Undergrounding Project

Mr. Morgan reported that PGE is ready, waiting for cable TV to get their lines down. The decorative poles will be here next week; installation of the pole bases will begin this week. The portion of River Road not covered by decorative lights will be dark for two or three weeks once the existing poles are taken down.

Banners

Ms. Abbott pointed out the difficulty the committee was having in coordinating efforts with the Chamber of Commerce. She had been unable to get an inventory of what the Chamber currently has. She wondered if the committee should proceed with selecting and purchasing banners on its own, and involve the Chamber only with maintenance and storage.

Ms. Abbott felt that this year the group should focus on getting banners up for Christmas. It was pointed out that something would have to be done very soon.

Mr. VanMeter indicated a preference to assist the Chamber with partial funding towards the banners or advise them, but for R3B not to take on the roll of buying banners on its own. He suggested that Ms. Abbott communicate to the Chamber that R3B is awaiting a recommendation.

Jackie Moir from the Gubser Neighborhood commented that this will be the 10th anniversary of the *Miracle of Christmas*. She noted that the neighborhood association plans to involve the Chamber in getting businesses along River Road to light up.

Mr. Morgan clarified for Ms. Abbott that $10,000 to $12,000 is budgeted for banner bars and one round of banners. Volunteers would have to install the bars and string the banners. Mr. Compton reiterated his suggestion to get the community involved in purchasing banners.

Mr. VanMeter requested that Chairman Compton send a letter to the Chamber indicating that R3B will entertain their recommendations on banners for River Road. Mr. Compton agreed to send a letter, and Ms. Abbott will attend the next Chamber meeting.

6. DISCUSSION

6.1 Gateway Sign - Lockhaven & River Road

Mr. Morgan displayed a revised plan submitted by the Inland Shores Developers. He noted that the double sign previously proposed was replaced with a single sign for Inland Shores. They still plan to do a large landscape project across the entire property, and have submitted a request for a $50,000 matching fund grant. Mr. Morgan noted that they hope to build this Fall.

Mr. Morgan stated that although a quorum was not present, he wished to carry to next Monday's Urban Renewal Agency meeting the informal recommendation of those members present tonight.

The Board informally discussed how much money should be granted for the improvement. Mr. Morgan responded to questions about available funds and grants previously awarded. It was felt that the landscape project would be a real asset to the City, but that $50,000 would be inappropriate in that something would still need to be done on the City's corner, and it was not yet known how many other properties on River Road might request funding.

After discussion, there was general support for awarding a $25,000 grant to Inland Shores for the project.

6.2 Automotive Related Uses at River & Chemawa Center

Mr. Morgan explained that the ordinance restricting automotive related uses at River & Chemawa has sunset. He noted that the Planning Commission is recommending to reinstate the ordinance until the new Development Code is adopted. They are recommending February 1, 1997 as the new sunset date. He noted that the ordinance is being submitted to Council next Monday night for a hearing.

Mr. Compton suggested extending the ordinance to July 1, 1997 to ensure that the corner is protected until a new code is adopted.

After discussion, support was indicated for extending the ordinance, but with a July 1, 1997 sunset instead of February 1.

7. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND AGENDA INPUT

The meeting was adjourned by Chairman Compton at 9:25 p.m.