CITY OF KEIZER MISSION STATEMENT
KEEP CITY GOVERNMENT COSTS AND SERVICES TO A MINIMUM BY PROVIDING BASIC CITY SERVICES TO THE COMMUNITY IN A COORDINATED, EFFICIENT AND LEAST COST FASHION

A G E N D A
KEIZER CITY COUNCIL
Monday, June 21, 1993
7:30 p.m.
Robert L. Simon Council Chambers
Keizer City Hall
Keizer, Oregon 97303

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

2. **ROLL CALL**

3. **SIGNING CEREMONY**

    a. Keizer Heritage Use Agreement

4. **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

    This time is provided for citizens to address the Council on matters not on the agenda.

5. **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

    a. 1992-93 Supplemental Budget

    b. Neighborhood Associations Ordinance

6. **DELIBERATION**

    a. RESOLUTION - Adopting 1992-93 Supplemental Budget and Making Appropriations

    b. Neighborhood Associations Ordinance

7. **ORDINANCE**

8. **DISCUSSION**

    a. RESOLUTION - Transferring Appropriations

    b. RESOLUTION - Adoption of 1993-94 Budget for the City of Keizer

c. RESOLUTION - Housing Issues

d. Initiate Amendment to Keizer Little League Conditional Use Agreement

e. Chemawa Activity Center Report

9. CONSENT CALENDAR

a. Update on Periodic Review

b. RESOLUTION - The Meadows Phase 6 Street Lighting District

c. RESOLUTION - Max Court Street Lighting District

d. Approval of June 7, 1993 Regular Session Minutes

10. OTHER BUSINESS

This time is provided to allow Council members the opportunity to bring matters before the Council which are not on tonight's agenda.

11. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

To inform the Council of significant written communications and petitions.

12. AGENDA INPUT

July 6, 1993 (Tuesday) - 7:30 p.m.
Chemawa Activity Center Public Hearing
Update on progress of Goals
Review Temporary Blocking of 4th Place
Closure of Sandy/Newberg
Street Overlay Project
Street Maintenance Agreement with Marion County

July 19, 1993 - 7:30 p.m.
ADA Self Evaluation Public Hearing
Marion County Building/Planning Agreement

13. ADJOURN

K:\agendas\council.6-21

1982

City of Keizer

930 Chemawa Rd. N.E. • P.O. Box 21000
Keizer, Oregon 97307-1000 • (503) 390-3700 • Fax # 393-9437

CITY COUNCIL MEETING: June 21, 1993

AGENDA ITEM NUMBER: 3a

TO: MAYOR KOHO AND CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS

FROM: DOTTY TRYK Dotty
CITY MANAGER

SUBJECT: KEIZER HERITAGE USE AGREEMENT

Members of the Keizer Heritage Foundation will be present at the meeting for the signing of the agreement recently approved.

City of Keizer
930 Chemawa Rd. N.E. • P.O. Box 21000
Keizer, Oregon 97307-1000 • (503) 390-3700 • Fax # 393-9437

1982

CITY COUNCIL MEETING: June 21, 1993

AGENDA ITEM NUMBER: 5a & 6a

TO: MAYOR KOHO AND CITY COUNCIL

FROM: DOTTY TRYK Dotty
CITY MANAGER

SUBJECT: RESOLUTION ADOPTING A SUPPLEMENTAL BUDGET AND MAKING APPROPRIATIONS

BACKGROUND:

Several unforeseen events have occurred since the adoption of the budget for fiscal year 1993 which would require modification of the original appropriations. State law recognizes several ways to bring a budget into compliance. The two that are being recommended tonight are a transfer resolution, which will be discussed in a later action, and a supplemental budget.

The two processes were chosen because not all the events of 1993 could be appropriated for through a transfer resolution. Those additional requirements can be covered through a supplemental budget process. A supplemental budget process is used to recognize unanticipated events that cannot be covered by contingency or allowable fund transfers and where there is unexpected additional revenue to fund the budget requirements. If the requested changes are less than 10% of the affected fund, the Council may hold a public hearing and adopt the supplemental budget.

This supplemental budget request covers unexpected revenue and expenditure activity in the General Fund. Specifically, they are:

1. The effectiveness of the traffic enforcement team resulted in an increase in citation activity. The effect was additional revenues and additional court assessments which were not included in the original budget.

2. The appointment of a full time acting City Recorder increased the Municipal Court Personal Services expenditures because that individual was accounted for in the Municipal Court budget as a part-time employee.

CITY COUNCIL, CITY OF KEIZER, STATE OF OREGON

Resolution R93-

ADOPTING A SUPPLEMENTAL BUDGET

AND MAKING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1992-93

WHEREAS, the Keizer City Council adopted a budget for the City of Keizer for the 1992-93 fiscal year on September 21, 1992;

WHEREAS, there have been occurrences which were not ascertained at the time of the preparation of the budget for the 1992-93 fiscal year and which require a change in the City's fiscal planning;

WHEREAS, there has occurred a pressing need which was not foreseen at the time of the preparation of the budget and which requires action; **NOW THEREFORE,**

BE IT RESOLVED, by the City Council of the City of Keizer that the budget appropriations shown below are hereby adopted:

	Current Budget	Supplemental Budget	Change
General Fund Expenditures:			
Administration-Materials & Supplies	128,312	146,612	18,300
Municipal Court-Personal Services	26,501	32,701	6,200
Municipal Court-Materials & Supplies	48,431	59,931	5,500
Total Increase to Fund			**30,000**

PASSED this __________ day of ______________, 1993.

SIGNED this __________ day of ______________, 1993.

____
Mayor

____
City Recorder

1982

City of Keizer

930 Chemawa Rd. N.E. • P.O. Box 21000
Keizer, Oregon 97307-1000 • (503) 390-3700 • Fax # 393-9437

CITY COUNCIL MEETING: June 21, 1993

AGENDA ITEM NUMBER: 5b & 6b

TO: MAYOR KOHO AND CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS

THROUGH: DOTTY TRYK
CITY MANAGER

FROM: JOHN N. MORGAN
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR

SUBJECT: NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATIONS

The Planning Commission has considered the draft Neighborhood Association Ordinance over the course of two meetings. At the meeting of June 9, the Commission recommended approval of the ordinance to the City Council.

A draft Ordinance is attached which offers the concepts which will be in a final Ordinance. The City Attorney will provide a final Ordinance at your meeting. The ordinance has the following major features:

The premise of the ordinance is granting recognition to neighborhood associations. Recognition gives the following general advantages to an association:

Placement on mailing lists for agendas of all regular City meetings, such as City Council, Planning Commission, and Parks Board.

Notification of City issues under consideration within the Association's boundaries.

The City will formally request the input of associations on important city issues, such as budgets, comprehensive planning, and special projects such as the Library Task Force.

In many cases, the associations will be offered a seat on task forces and committees.

Associations will have standing in land use cases.

Promotion of neighborhood activities through City channels, such as the City newsletter.

In order to be granted recognition, an association must make a formal request to the Council. The request is to be judged against several criteria, which include:

By-Laws that meet certain standards designed to maximize the capability of people to participate in the Association's activities, and to help assure the Association is a true representative of the interests of the residents of the neighborhood.

Geographic boundaries that are logical, that include all related areas, and include lands for probable future development.

A size of at least 300 dwelling units.

The final point is the only one that has raised significant comment. In fact, the Planning Commission split on this point. The Commission's vote was five to two. The Commission asked that the opinions of the minority be expressed to the Council. In the case of both Commissioners, they felt 300 dwelling units was to large. One Commissioner suggested 150 while the other advocated no minimum size. This Commissioner argued that nothing should stand in the way of a group organizing and approaching the Council.

The Police Department expressed concern that neighborhood associations should reflect current work to encourage neighborhood watch organizations, which are generally much smaller than 300 dwelling units. However, Staff believes larger neighborhood associations will serve to encourage and foster development of smaller neighborhood watch organizations within their boundaries.

Staff believes there are three important points to be considered in establishing a minimum size:

A neighborhood association should be large enough to not be a "one-issue" organization.

A neighborhood association should be large enough to be able to strongly participate in community wide issues, not just neighborhood issues.

A neighborhood association should be large enough to be self-perpetuating, with a large reservoir of people to serve in leadership positions over the course of time.

Given these objectives, Staff finds 300 dwelling units to be a reasonable guideline, but believes going as small as 150 dwelling units would be workable. The number should be established as a guideline with the final decision resting with the City Council.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended Council adopt the Neighborhood Association Ordinance.

AN ORDINANCE
RELATING TO
NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATIONS

Purpose. This ordinance is intended to recognize that neighborhood associations are an important part of the involvement and volunteerism of the citizens of the community in Keizer city government. Active neighborhood associations enhance the City's citizen involvement program and provide an important two way channel for information relative to the activities of the City. This ordinance is intended to provide a framework for establishment and recognition of neighborhood association and to acknowledge such associations as legitimate representatives of the citizens and issues within their boundaries. The long term goal is to encourage formation of associations throughout the City, at the initiative of the citizens.

Neighborhood Associations. A neighborhood association is any group of people organized within a geographical area for the purpose of studying and acting on issues affecting neighborhood and city-wide livability and government operations, and that also actively solicits broad involvement by all citizens within the association's boundary. A recognized neighborhood association is one that has been found by the City Council to satisfy the standards of this ordinance.

Recognition. The City Council may officially recognize a neighborhood association as described in Section X, below. For a recognized neighborhood association the City will do the following, at a minimum:

Mail the association requests for comments and public hearing notices for all planning, zoning, and subdivision activities within its boundaries.

Mail the association notices of other City issues that may result in action being taken impacting property or the citizens within the association boundary.

Mail the association agendas for all City commissions, boards, and City Council meetings.

Solicit the input of the association at early stages of major decision making such as annual budget preparation and amendments to the Comprehensive Plan.

Recognize the association as having standing in land use cases within its boundaries or within adjacent areas where there is a direct impact.

Consider petitions from neighborhood associations for amendments to the Comprehensive Plan, including development of neighborhood land-use plan, and for amendments to ordinances.

Provide assistance in publicizing the activities of the association through press releases, city publications, and other media as resources allow.

Process for Recognition. A neighborhood association may petition the City Council for official recognition. If the Council finds that the standards outlined below are met, the association may be recognized by resolution.

Standards for Recognition. The following standards must be met by a neighborhood association seeking and maintaining recognition:

By-Laws - The Association shall adopt by-laws that contain the following provisions at a minimum:

Any person who resides, operates a business, or owns property within the boundary shall be a member with the right to participate and vote.

The membership shall not be limited by race, creed, color, sex, age, or any other factor.

There shall be no dues, but voluntary contributions may be solicited.

The association shall hold an annual general meeting, with the time, date, and place of the meeting widely publicized throughout the neighborhood prior to the meeting. Other general meetings may be held as desired.

Regular meetings of the Board shall be held at a publicized date, time, and place. All Board meetings shall be open to the public. All members present may vote on issues with the results recorded separately from votes of the Board.

Minutes shall be taken of all Board and General meetings, with the minutes made available to any person so requesting. A copy of the minutes shall be filed with the City Recorder.

The association shall have a Board of Directors with a president, vice-president, and secretary who shall be elected annually by those present at the annual meeting. The association may establish additional elected positions on the Board. The board roster including names and addresses shall be filed with the City Recorder.

A copy of the by-laws shall be filed with the City Recorder and maintained and updated to reflect amendments by the neighborhood association.

Boundary - The Association shall adopt by motion a fixed geographic boundary meeting the following general guidelines:

The neighborhood should encompass at least 300 dwelling units.

The neighborhood should encompass a logical geographic and social area with generally rectangular boundaries and without any gerrymandering.

The neighborhood should generally focus on a single elementary school attendance area.

Neighborhood boundaries should generally follow natural or manmade barriers such as creeks and arterial streets. When a boundary must follow a local street, it should follow rear property lines rather than divide the neighborhood between houses facing each other.

The boundary should encompass adjacent vacant or underdeveloped land.

The boundary should extend to the City Limits.

The boundary should leave no isolated areas or pockets not included in another neighborhood association's boundary.

The Council shall have the final determination of a neighborhood's boundary. This determination shall be reflected in the resolution of recognition.

Responsibilities - The following responsibilities must be assumed and carried out by a neighborhood association:

The association must strive to accurately represent the best interest of is members when expressing neighborhood opinion, recommendations, and concerns before any public body.

The association must try to solicit the participation or input of all members through newsletters, media coverage, personal contact, flyer distribution, and other means.

The association must actively participate in City government through participation, input, and recommendations on issues brought to it by the City, or initiated by the neighborhood itself.

The association must hold regular board and general meetings, with timely, appropriate notification to members.

The association must strive to improve the livability of the neighborhood and of the community as a whole through education, activities, projects, and participation.

Maintaining Recognition - Annual Report. A recognized neighborhood association shall make an annual report to the City Council at a Council meeting no more than one month before or one month after the anniversary of the Council's recognition. This report may be in writing or presented orally. The report shall include at least the following elements:

A record of all meetings.

A summary of all issues dealt with by the association.

A summary of special association activities outside regular meetings

A report of all efforts to solicit the participation and input of all members of the association

An analysis of the Association's success in meeting its responsibilities as outlined above.

Maintaining Recognition - Council Action - If the Council finds the association has continued to meet the expectations and responsibilities of a neighborhood association, it shall, by motion, extend recognition for an additional year.

Terminating Recognition - At any time the Council may consider an association's alleged failure to meet the expectations and responsibilities of a neighborhood association. If it finds the association is not meeting the standards, it may, by resolution, revoke recognition.

City of Keizer
1982
930 Chemawa Rd. N.E. • P.O. Box 21000
Keizer, Oregon 97307-1000 • (503) 390-3700 • Fax # 393-9437

CITY COUNCIL MEETING: June 21, 1993

AGENDA ITEM NUMBER: 8a

TO: MAYOR KOHO AND CITY COUNCIL

FROM: DOTTY TRYK
CITY MANAGER

SUBJECT: RESOLUTION TRANSFERRING APPROPRIATIONS

BACKGROUND:

Several events occurred in fiscal year 1993 which were not anticipated in the adopted budget. State Law requires that municipal expenditures remain within the dollar amount appropriated in the categories adopted by the Council in the Resolution adopting the Budget.

Most of these were employee salary decisions made by the Council during the year. Because the departments have kept close watch on their budgets this year, there is enough flexibility in most instances to transfer appropriations from the materials and services categories to the personal service categories in the same department. In the Street Fund and Water Fund, contingency transfers can increase the appropriations.

In the General Fund, the Contingency of $50,000 is necessary to cover unexpected expenses in the Administration budget. As discussed under a previous action, the Administration Department experienced several unusual expenses in 1993. These included three elections--May 1992, September 1992 and March 1993. The costs for recruiting and hiring a new manager were not anticipated. In fiscal year 1993, the City required extensive legal services for a variety of issues including development of personnel rules, department head contracts, labor negotiations and several personnel and legal issues. It is hoped that the newly hired expertise in this area and the professionalizing of the personnel function will help to control some of these costs in the future.

RECOMMENDATION:

These interfund transfers and transfers of Contingency amounts will allow the necessary changes to authorize the expenditures.

Staff recommends adoption of the Resolution.

CITY COUNCIL, CITY OF KEIZER, STATE OF OREGON

Resolution R93-____

TRANSFERRING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1992-93

WHEREAS, the Keizer City Council adopted a budget for the City of Keizer for the 1992-93 fiscal year on September 21, 1992;

WHEREAS, there have been occurrences which were specifically anticipated at the time of the preparation of the budget for the 1992-93 fiscal year for the funds indicated below;

WHEREAS, ORS.294.450 (3) provides for the transfer of appropriations within a fund; **NOW, THEREFORE,**

BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Keizer, that appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1993 be transferred in the amounts indicated below:

General Fund:

	Increase	Decrease
Admin-Materials & Services	50,000	
Contingency		50,000
Planning-Personal Services	5,000	
Planning-Materials & Services		5,000
Police-Personal Services	22,000	
Police-Materials & Services		22,000
Total General Fund	**77,000**	**77,000**

Street Fund:

	Increase	Decrease
Personal Services	5,000	
Contingency		5,000
Total Street Fund	**5,000**	**5,000**

Water Fund:

	Increase	Decrease
Personal Services	30,000	
Debt Service	5,635	
Contingency		35,635
Total Water Fund	**35,635**	**35,635**

Utility Fund:

Personal Services	1,000	
Materials & Supplies		1,000
Total Utility Fund	**1,000**	**1,000**
Total All Funds	**118,635**	**118,635**

PASSED this __________ day of __________,1993

SIGNED this __________ day of __________,1993

____
Mayor

____
City Recorder

City of Keizer
Administration
930 Chemawa Rd. N.E. • P.O. Box 21000
Keizer, Oregon 97307-1000 • (503) 390-3700 • Fax # 390-8295

CITY COUNCIL MEET: June 21, 1993

AGENDA ITEM NO: 8b

TO: MAYOR KOHO AND COUNCIL MEMBERS

FROM: DOTTY TRYK Dotty
CITY MANAGER

SUBJECT: RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE FY'94 BUDGET, MAKING APPROPRIATIONS AND LEVYING TAXES

BACKGROUND:

The Budget Committee, comprised of the Council and seven lay members, reviewed the Recommended Budget for Fiscal Year 1994 and approved it for Council consideration. The Council held a public hearing on March 15, 1993 for the purpose of hearing public input and setting a levy request.

At that meeting, the Council approved several changes to the Approved Budget. These were:

1. Increasing General Fund Revenues--Municipal Court Fines from $120,000 to $140,000.

2. Increasing General Fund Revenues--Special Duty Officers from $0 to $1,000.

3. Decreasing Police Capital Outlay by $14,800, moving the capital expenditures to the Revenue Sharing Fund thereby increasing Revenue Sharing Capital Outlay by $14,800 and reducing Contingency by $14,800.

4. Increasing the Community Development Contractual Services from $3,000 to $4,000.

These changes are reflected in the Appropriations Resolution.

In addition, some capital improvement projects budgeted to be complete by the end of the current fiscal year will not be completed until later this summer. Therefore the budgeted expenditures in FY'93 will not occur and should be carried over for completion of the projects in FY'94. These are:

1. Water Facilities Replacement Fund--Meadows Well increase to $225,000 from $0. This project has not occurred in this year and is expected to be done next year. $150,000 is budgeted for the well itself and $75,000 for the associated water line and storm drainage work. The budget will be adjusted for this by reducing the Reserve for Future by a like amount.

2. Street Fund--Street Resurfacing increase from $300,000 to $383,000. This is due to the resurfacing of Maine and Linda which was delayed by rain. The beginning fund balance will be increased by a like amount.

3. Revenue Sharing--Records Management increase from $0 to $15,000. There are still several options to analyze before making an informed decision, therefore the City will not be ready to bid for another few weeks. This will be offset by an increase in the beginning fund balance.

There is an additional correction that can be made in the Adopted Budget. A transfer which was budgeted from the General Fund to the Parks Improvement Fund in 1992 was never made. This money is accumulated Parks SDCs and should be in the Parks Improvement Fund. Making this correction would result in a change as follows:

> General Fund-Transfers to Parks Improvement Fund increased to $34,424 from $0.
> Parks Improvement Fund-Contingency increased from $0 to $34,424.

These changes are also reflected in the attached Resolution.

This Resolution also declares the Ad Valorem Tax Levy which is the authorized tax base and the voter approved one year operating levy.

The Council has the authority to adjust resources; reduce or eliminate any expenditure; or increase expenditures if it is by no more than 10% of the fund total

RECOMMENDATION:

This budget has been well considered by the Budget Committee and Council. The citizens gave their approval of the plan by approving an operating levy. Therefore, staff recommends adoption of the Resolution containing the above adjustments.

CITY COUNCIL, CITY OF KEIZER, STATE OF OREGON

RESOLUTION R93-

ADOPTING THE FY'94 BUDGET, MAKING APPROPRIATIONS AND LEVYING TAXES

BE IT RESOLVED, that the City Council of the City of Keizer hereby adopts a budget for fiscal year 1993-94 in the sum of $10,092,003.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the amounts for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1993, and for the purposes shown below are hereby appropriated as follows:

General Fund			
	Administration	289,907	
	Community Development	90,328	
	Municipal Court	112,595	
	Police	1,839,153	
	Parks	82,684	
	Maintenance	4,714	
	Contingency	50,000	
	Transfers	34,424	
Total General Fund			**$2,503,805**
Revenue Sharing			
	Capital Outlay	205,600	
	Contingency	35,200	
Total Revenue Sharing Fund			**$240,800**
Park Improvement Fund			
	Capital Outlay	75,000	
	Contingency	34,424	
Total Park Improvement Fund			**$109,424**
City Hall Replacement Fund			
	Capital Outlay	40,000	
	Contingency	20,000	
Total City Hall Replacement Fund			**$60,000**

Emergency Communications			
	Materials & Supplies	81,500	
Total Emergency Communications			**$81,500**
Water Fund			
	Water Services	1,171,855	
	Contingency	50,000	
	Debt Service	363,210	
Total Water Fund			**$1,585,065**
Water Facility Replacement Reserve			
	Capital Outlay	520,000	
Total Water Facility Replacement Reserve			**$520,000**
Street Fund			
	Street Services	1,894,040	
	Debt Service	60,030	
	Contingency	200,000	
Total Street Fund			**$2,154,070**
Lockhaven Reserve			
	Transfers	384,700	
Total Lockhaven Reserve			**$384,700**
Utilities Fund			
	Utilities Services	1,963,715	
	Debt Service	438,924	
	Contingency	50,000	
Total Utilities Fund			**$2,452,639**
Total All Funds			**$10,092,003**

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the City council of the City of Keizer hereby levies the taxes provided for in the adopted budget in the aggregate amount of $1,172,025; and that these taxes are hereby levied upon the assessed value as of 1:00 a.m., July 1, 1993, on all taxable property within the district. The following levies constitute the above aggregate levy:

GENERAL FUND

Operating Levy Within the 6% Limitation	$635,225
One Year Operating Levy	536,800
TOTAL TAX LEVY	**$1,172,025**

PASSED this _______ day of __________________, 1993

SIGNED this _______ day of __________________, 1993

____
Mayor

____
City Recorder

1982

City of Keizer

930 Chemawa Rd. N.E. • P.O. Box 21000
Keizer, Oregon 97307-1000 • (503) 390-3700 • Fax # 393-9437

CITY COUNCIL MEETING: June 21, 1993

AGENDA ITEM NUMBER: 8c

TO: MAYOR KOHO AND CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS

THROUGH: DOTTY TRYK Dotty
CITY MANAGER

FROM: JOHN N. MORGAN, AICP
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR

SUBJECT: HOUSING ISSUES

ISSUE:

Several questions were raised at the Council meeting of June 7 about the options for assisting citizens of Keizer with housing needs. This report will begin discussion of these issues. A copy of the June 7 staff report is attached for the Council's information. The report asks the Council to take two actions at this time, and to set a workshop on housing to deal with other issues in detail.

BACKGROUND:

The Council and community have been actively discussing housing needs for about two years. The adopted Keizer Tomorrow Community Vision Statement includes the following vision about housing:

> ***Vision* - All housing in Keizer will be in a safe and sanitary condition.**
>
> *Implementation Strategy* - Keizer will begin a housing rehabilitation program. This can take several forms including, but not limited to, urban renewal, community development block grant, regional housing agency, and public/private partnerships. The process will include a detailed housing inventory and needs

analysis followed by development of a housing plan and implementation program. Of highest priority is the development and implementation of a multi-family housing code and inspection program.

Cost to Implement - Several thousand dollars in staff time may be necessary for the start-up effort, and up to one-quarter of a staff for on-going administration.

Source of Funds - These types of programs generally receive the majority of their funds from federal and state sources. However, it must be anticipated there will be some local costs, including start-up expenses and a portion of the administration, paid through either General Fund or the Urban Renewal District. The multi-family inspection program should be self supporting through licensing fees.

<u>DISCUSSION:</u>

There are several options for actions to achieve this Vision. A broad gamut of programs with varying levels of involvement and resource allocations is available to the City. There is one over-riding and common factor, however, that will be discussed first.

<u>Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy</u>

For all programs involving State or Federal funds, the City must have a Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS). This important planning tool is exactly what it says; the establishment of a strategy for meeting the community's housing needs. Such a document is a well researched and well founded program for clearly identifying need, and establishing the best course for meeting it.

A CHAS is adopted by the local governing body. It is based on the best approaches to meet housing needs, while also reflecting local goals and values. It also reflects the financial realities of the community.

Keizer has the option at this immediate time to join with Salem in developing a Salem/Keizer Urban Area CHAS. This document will address the needs of the entire community. It can differentiate in details between Keizer and Salem, reflecting what is most important to each individual community.

Staff's sense of the Council opinion is that Keizer's greatest need in housing assistance is in serving those in need who already live in the community. The 1992 Housing Condition Survey (Cogan, Sharpe, & Cogan) showed Keizer's housing is generally in adequate or better shape, with a few isolated spots with serious problems. Therefore, it appears the best approach for Keizer is to "help its own" and to concentrate on keeping the existing housing stock in good shape. These directions can be reflected in the CHAS as the focus of the housing strategy for Keizer.

With such a strategy adopted by the Council, all projects proposed in the City must be evaluated to determine if they conform with the housing strategy. Probably housing programs that focus on rehabilitation and repair will be the forefront of Keizer's housing efforts.

Options for Housing Programs

Three general areas of potential involvement by the City reflecting the general direction discussed above have been identified. They are listed below with an indication of the types of programs that can be used in each area.

Rehabilitation of Multi-Family Housing
- HOME Program
- Community Development Block Grant
- Multi-Family Housing Licensing Program
- Renewal Agency Housing Program
- Chronic Nuisance Ordinance

Rehabilitation of Single Family Housing
- Community Development Block Grant
- HOME Program

First Time Home Buyer
- HOME Program

At the Council meeting, Staff will present a summary of each program, including these four components:

- Program Elements
- Administration Options
- Funding Sources
- Requirements

Other background information will also be presented. The Staff's recommendation, however, is that the material not be discussed at this meeting. Rather a workshop should be called for Monday, July 12, where detailed discussion of each issue can take plan, along with presentations by outside speakers with experience and expertise in these programs.

HOME Program

While the specific program discussion is being recommended to be delayed until July 12, Staff is asking Council to reach a decision on participation in the Salem/Keizer Housing Consortium, and its funding through the HOME program. The commitment must be made by July 1 in order to participate in the following year. Therefore, if Council wishes to participate in the next year, a positive decision must be made tonight.

The primary concern of the Council at the June 7 meeting centered on being able to focus any HOME funded projects to meet the needs of the City as defined by the Council. The Council's priority for assisting with housing needs targets rehabilitation and maintenance of existing housing. As reflected in the discussion of the CHAS above, this is the strategy that appears to best serve the community.

The Council has control over HOME funded projects in two ways. First, the CHAS provides the avenue to formalize the strategy expressed above. Projects must conform with the CHAS. Therefore, if the Council's strategy is to rehabilitate substandard multi-family housing, these are the types of projects that can be funded.

Second, Council has control of the local match if it is to involve any City expenditure. This allows a case-by-case review to determine if a project meets the City's needs, and warrants a community investment.

Attached to this Staff Report is a brochure from HUD outlining the HOME program. It offers answers to many of the Council questions.

CONCLUSIONS

Keizer is in an enviable position. The City's housing stock is in relatively good shape. However, there are two threats to this status. First, pockets of housing in poor shape provide a sub-standard housing environment for a number of Keizer citizens. These sites are only getting worse, and impact the values and conditions of neighboring properties. These "pockets" have a very real potential of spreading.

Second, there are members of the Keizer community in need. Low and moderate income owners and renters are faced with needs to repair and rehabilitate existing housing in order to maintain a "safe and sanitary" housing environment. Yet, in some cases, the property owners do not have the resources to make necessary repairs.

A multi-pronged approach to these issues is available and do-able for minimal investment of City resources. The approach includes these components:

Participate with Salem in preparation of an urban area CHAS in order to finalize and formalize the City's strategy for meeting housing needs.

Join with Salem in a Salem/Keizer HOME Consortium in order to make HOME funds available for use in the City for projects that conform with Keizer's housing strategy as expressed in the CHAS. The need for and approval of any city funded match is decided by the Council on a case-by-case basis. Other non-city match may be available. Administration of the program is by Salem.

Discuss in depth the applicability and appropriateness of other programs, such as Community Development Block Grants from the State of Oregon, Multi-Family licensing, and a Chronic Nuisance Ordinance, in meeting the housing needs and strategy expressed in the adopted CHAS.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended the City Council:

1. Authorize the Mayor to sign the agreement forming a Salem/Keizer HOME Consortium; and

2. Agree to participate in the preparation and consideration of an urban area Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy and authorize Staff to proceed with the process.

3. Call a special Council Workshop for 7:00 PM on Monday, July 12, 1993 to discuss housing issues and opportunities.

City of Keizer — Community Development

1982

Phone: 390-3700 • Fax # 393-9437
930 Chemawa Rd. N.E. • P.O. Box 21000 • Keizer, Oregon 97307-1000

CITY COUNCIL MEETING: June 7, 1993

AGENDA ITEM NUMBER: 8b

TO: MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL

THROUGH: DOTTY TRYK Dotty
CITY MANAGER

FROM: JOHN N. MORGAN, AICP
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR

SUBJECT: HOUSING ISSUES

SUMMARY:

On November 16, 1992, the Council held a regular meeting with a focus on housing issues. This meting brought together many discussions on the quality of housing in Keizer, and the need to provide some intervention to assure continued maintenance of the housing stock. There was a recognition that housing in Keizer is generally in good condition, with a few significant exceptions. At that meeting, the results of a regional housing condition survey were reported, which confirmed this recognition. From that meeting, Staff left challenged to find ways to help assure that housing in Keizer is and remains safe and sanitary, and that also do not involve major time, investment, or intervention by Keizer City Government.

The problems to be addressed distilled to two major focus areas:

1. Keeping all housing in a condition that meets minimum standards for health and safety.

2. Assisting those in need with necessary repairs to keep the existing housing stock in relatively good condition.

In the intervening half year, Staff has worked closely with Salem and Marion County, and with a consortium of other Marion County cities, in exploring these issues, and reaching specific recommendations. The results of this work are presented to Council this evening for consideration and action. Two specific actions are being recommended; a chronic nuisance ordinance to address housing conditions; and entering into a housing consortium with Salem to provide assistance to homeowners in maintaining existing housing. Each of these will be described below:

ISSUE ONE - Housing Conditions

Within the last two years the City has received numerous complaints regarding housing conditions. The complaints concern faulty wiring, leaky roofs and substandard plumbing. These problems can result in unsafe and unsanitary living conditions. In response the City Council directed Staff to investigate the possibility of enacting a housing code. The purpose of a housing code is to establish regulations which continually ensure clean and safe housing, with special emphasis on multi-family residences.

The City joined with other Marion County communities to form the North Willamette Valley Housing Coalition (NWVHC). The group met once a month to discuss and explore possible remedies to housing and nuisance problems through the sharing of information and ideas. After eight months of work the Coalition reached a conclusion as to what is practical and possible. The following is a summary of the Coalition's work and its application in Keizer.

The Coalition is recommending a chronic nusance ordinance as the best way to approach problem housing. Such an ordinance generally says that if a property is the site of chronic illegal activity, the city can take action to remedy the situation, including ordering the property closed. A draft ordinance to this effect has been prepared and currently is under review by the Police Department. It will be presented to the Council for consideration on June 21, 1993.

ISSUE TWO - Repair and Rehabilitation

It is with great regularity that Staff receives inquiries about the City's programs to assist low to moderate income homeowners with household repairs. Of course, there are no such programs in Keizer and these people are told we cannot help. Generally this is met with dismay, as people are aware such programs operate in surrounding communities.

Housing rehabilitation programs generally take two forms; the first is the provision of services by a local jurisdiction, the second is provision of houses through a non-profit housing organization. In both cases, the bulk of the funds comes from Federal sources. Keizer has never taken the steps necessary to participate in these programs, primarily because of the extensive staff time involved. Such programs require the jurisdiction to first have a Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (or CHAS), second to make the necessary applications through the State Housing Division, and third to administer the program, either through direct service delivery, or through administration of grants to the non-profit organizations. In any case, one or more staff people are necessary to establish and administer such a program.

New Federal regulations have provided Keizer with an opportunity to meet the housing need within the community without the extensive involvement outlined above. The National Affordable Housing Act of 1990 created the HOME program. The HOME program is a form of housing grants to entitlement cities based upon a formula taking population and housing needs into account. Cities with a long and successful history of housing program administration can be designated "entitlement" cities. Salem is such a city and has participated in the HOME program for about one year. Entitlement cities have a great deal of authority and latitude to administer housing programs independently, and without direct involvement from the State Housing Division. They also can form "housing consortiums" with surrounding cities extending their programs into these other jurisdictions. Springfield enjoys such a relationship with Eugene, as do several Metro communities with Portland. Salem has asked Keizer to join with it in a housing consortium.

HOME funds allocated to Salem this year totaled $598,000. Adding Keizer's population to the formula will result in the allocation to the new Consortium reaching or possibly exceeding $750,000.

Attached to this report is a draft intergovernmental agreement that will establish a Housing Consortium. General points of consideration include the following:

1. Allocation of funds is based on individual project proposals. In a given year both cities and several non-profit housing organizations may propose specific projects. For example, in Keizer, Oregon Housing and Associated Services, Inc., (a private non-profit organization that has expressed strong interest in operating in Keizer), could propose a rehabilitation grant program for low-income homeowners to assist with basic repairs such as leaky roofs; or Keizer, through the River Road Redevelopment District, could propose establishment of a revolving loan fund to be used for repairs for elderly homeowners within the District's boundaries. All such proposals are considered for funding from the total amount available.

2. Administration of projects and administration of the program is by Salem. As the entitlement city, Salem retains control of the funding. Just as with federal transportation funding, there is no requirement to allocate a certain amount of money to each political jurisdiction. However, the agreement states that efforts will be made to spend funds in proportion to the population of each city, but the top priority for projects will be the merit of the project, not its geographic location. The agreement requires consultation with the Keizer staff before decisions are made.

3. Keizer does not need to provide staff for administration of any aspect of the program. Ten percent of the HOME allocation pays for program administration. The existing Salem staff will use these funds to continue to operate the program, expanding the operation in to Keizer.

4. For all projects, a local match is required. This match can come from many sources such as state or local bond proceeds, assessed projects, Oregon Housing Trust funds, cost sharing

such as the City doing necessary utility work for a site paid from enterprise funds, private funds as may be put forward by a non-profit housing corporation, bank write-down of a loan rate, urban renewal funds, or general fund. Keizer has total control of any City funds, and may decide to not enter into a project because of local budget priorities.

5. A CHAS needs to be developed for the entire two-jurisdiction area. Salem is proceeding with a CHAS and, if this consortium is approved, the CHAS will be expanded to cover Keizer. The document, and its strategies and priorities for housing, will need to be adopted by both Cities. There may be a small cost for Keizer's participation in the CHAS development. It is expected this would not exceed $3,000 which is available in FY 93-94 through the Urban Renewal and Community Development budgets.

6. Having an adopted CHAS makes Keizer eligible for many other outside funding sources. The primary source is Community Development Block Grants (CDBG). CDBG money can be used for a broad variety of projects in identified low to moderate income areas for projects such as street improvements and storm drain construction.

7. With a CHAS in place, Keizer can choose to develop and administrate its own HOME program, working through the State Housing Division. However, entering into the consortium allows the same benefits to be available to the City without the administrative overhead.

Key benefits of the Housing Consortium to Salem include:

- Greater assurance of continued funding
- Increased administrative funding while probably not requiring additional staff
- Development of a service area that is geographically almost identical to that of the Salem Housing Authority allowing greater coordination of programs
- Greater intergovernmental cooperation on a local and regional problem

Key benefits of the Housing Consortium to Keizer include:

- Funding to address identified housing problems
- Provision of a needed service without impacting the City Budget or creating new staff positions
- Availability of HOME funds without having to administer a local program
- Creation of a Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy with minimal city financial involvement

- As a result of having an adopted CHAS, the availability of other funds, especially Community Development Block Grants, to supplement other City funds for necessary projects.

CONCLUSIONS

1. Keizer has a relatively good housing stock. However, there are areas where dilapidation and decay are taking place. Plus, the health of the housing stock is threatened by the inability to assist low and moderate homeowners with necessary repairs and rehabilitation to maintain minimum levels of quality.

2. The Chronic Nuisance Ordinance provides a way to help assure maintenance of housing, while having the added benefit of extending to all structures and uses, and addressing issues beyond housing conditions.

3. The Housing Consortium provides the means to assist low and moderate homeowners with necessary repairs and rehabilitation to maintain minimum levels of quality.

4. No additional staff or financial commitments are necessary to carry out the program, other than relatively minor involvement in the preparation of the CHAS.

5. These two programs provide the structure the Council was seeking to addressing housing issues without making major changes in City staff or programs.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

It is recommended Council adopt the attached resolution authorizing the Mayor to enter into the intergovernmental agreement with the City of Salem establishing a Housing Consortium.

CITY COUNCIL, CITY OF KEIZER, STATE OF OREGON

Resolution R93- ______

AUTHORIZING A HOUSING CONSORTIUM AGREEMENT WITH

THE CITY OF SALEM

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of Keizer is desirous of entering into agreement with the City of Salem establishing a Housing Consortium; **NOW, THEREFORE,**

BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Keizer that the City enter into the attached Agreement with the City of Salem and that the Mayor and City Attorney are authorized to sign said agreement on behalf of the City of Keizer.

PASSED this _____ day of ________________, 1993.

SIGNED this _____ day of ________________, 1993.

____
Mayor

____
City Recorder

DRAFT

CONSORTIUM COOPERATION AGREEMENT

between

The CITY OF SALEM, an Oregon municipal corporation (Salem)

and

The CITY OF KEIZER, an Oregon municipal corporation (Keizer).

(1) Authority. This Agreement is entered into pursuant to ORS 190.010.

(2) Purpose. By this Agreement, the parties hereby form a consortium for the purpose of participation in the Federal Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Home Investment Partnership Program (HOME Program).

(3) Administration. Salem is designated the representative for both Salem and Keizer and assumes overall responsibility for ensuring that the consortium's HOME Program is carried out in compliance with the HOME Program law, including requirements concerning a Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) in accordance with federal law.

(4) CHAS. Keizer and Salem will jointly submit a single CHAS to HUD covering the entire geographic area of both cities. Keizer is responsible for assisting Salem in a timely manner to gather all information necessary for participation in the HOME Program including information for CHAS.

(5) Allocation of Funds. Funds will be allocated throughout the city limits of Salem and Keizer. Efforts shall be made to expend funds approximately in proportion to each jurisdiction's population over the life of the agreement. The top priority for funding projects will be the merit of the project and its conformance to the CHAS, rather than geographic location. Project priorities will be established with the advice of the Community Development Directors of Salem and Keizer.

(6) Publication of Materials. Any informational materials published for general public distribution shall display the Salem and Keizer logos with a notation that funding is provided by the Salem/Keizer HOME consortium.

(7) Fair Housing. The parties agree to take affirmative action to further fair housing in their jurisdictions. The parties also agree to cooperate to undertake or assist in undertaking housing assistance activities for the HOME Program.

(8) Adding New Members. Keizer authorizes Salem to amend this consortium agreement on behalf of the entire consortium to add qualified new members to the consortium.

(9) Term of Agreement. The parties shall not terminate this agreement prior to the completion of all activities to be funded by the HOME funds during the three federal fiscal years following the fiscal year in which this Agreement is executed. The parties are required to remain in the consortium and cannot terminate or withdraw during the entire period.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the undersigned parties have executed this Agreement as of the date set forth below.

CITY OF SALEM	**CITY OF KEIZER**
By: ____________________	By: ____________________
Mayor	Mayor
Date: ____________________	Date: ____________________
APPROVED AS TO FORM:	APPROVED AS TO FORM:
____________________	____________________
City Attorney	City Attorney

DD\CONSORTIUM.CO

Salem Housing Code

CHAPTER 59

HOUSING CODE

TITLE AND SCOPE

TITLE AND SCOPE

59.001. Repealed. (Ord No. 192-73;Ord No. 135-75)

59.002. SHORT TITLE. This chapter shall be known and may be cited as the Salem Housing Code. (Ord No. 135-75)

59.003. Repealed. (Ord No. 192-73;Ord No. 135-75)

59.004. PURPOSE. The purpose of this chapter is to provide minimum requirements for the protection of life, limb, health, property, safety, and welfare of the general public and the owners, occupants, and users of residential buildings. Nothing in this chapter shall be construed to authorize any work for which a permit is required under the UBC, UMC, UPC, or NEC to be done other than in accordance with all applicable provisions of such codes. (Ord No. 135-75)

59.005. Repealed. (Ord No. 192-73;Ord No. 35-74;Ord No. 135-75)

59.006. SCOPE. (a) The provisions of this chapter shall apply to all Group R-1 and R-3 occupancies as hereinafter defined as well as nursing homes and residential care homes as those terms are defined by SRC 32.144 and 32.146 respectively. Such occupancies lawfully in existence on September 9, 1975, may be continued provided they are maintained in compliance with the provisions of this chapter. Where any building contains more than one occupancy, the provisions of this chapter shall be applied to each separate occupancy within its scope as if each occupancy were a separate building.

(b) Each mobile home, trailer, and recreational vehicle which is used as a residence and which does not meet the requirements prescribed pursuant to ORS 446.002 to 446.200 shall comply with all of the requirements of this Code for Group R-3 occupancies, whether or not such mobile home, trailer, or recreational vehicle is placed on a permanent foundation or otherwise affixed to real property. (Ord No. 135-75;Ord No. 14-81;Ord No. 92-83)

59.008. EFFECT OF COMPLIANCE WITH NEW CONSTRUCTION CODES. It is not the intent of this chapter to impose any requirement more stringent than those contained in the UBC, the UMC, the UPC, and the NEC. Therefore, any design, material, or method of construction which would satisfy all applicable requirements of such codes for idential new construction shall be deemed approved for use under this chapter, notwithstanding any requirement herein which would be apparently more restrictive. (Ord No. 135-75)

59.010. Repealed. (Ord No. 192-73)

59.015. DEFINITIONS. As used in this chapter, except where the context otherwise requires:

(a) "Attic" means the unfinished, nonhabitable part of the building between the roof and the ceiling immediately below.

(b) "Building" includes structures so defined in the UBC, and also includes mobile homes, trailers, and recreational vehicles within the scope of this chapter as provided in SRC 59.006.

(c) "Ceiling height" means the clear vertical distance between the finished floor and the finished ceiling.

(d) "Superficial floor area" means the net floor area within the enclosing walls of a room, excluding built-in equipment such as wardrobes, cabinets, kitchen units, or fixtures and excluding all space where the ceiling height is less than four feet.

(e) "Window" means a glazed opening, including glazed portions of doors, which directly admits natural light from the outdoors; and, if openable, opens directly upon the outdoors. (Ord No. 135-75)

59.020. Repealed. (Ord No. 140-71;Ord No. 192-73)

59.025. ADDITIONAL DEFINITIONS. As used in this chapter, words defined in the UBC, UMC, UPC, or NEC, as adopted in Title V of this Code, shall have the meanings set forth in such codes, except where the context otherwise requires. (Ord No. 135-75)

59.030. Repealed. (Ord No. 177-69;Ord No. 140-71;Ord No. 192-73)

59.035. OCCUPANCIES DEFINED. As used in this chapter:

(a) "Group R-1 occupancy" means a building which contains three or more dwelling units, whether or not the units are under common ownership; or which is used for a hotel or apartment house; or which would otherwise be classified as a "Group R-1 Occupancy" under the UBC.

(b) "Group R-3 occupancy" means a dwelling or lodging house. (Ord No. 135-75;Ord No. 14-81)

ENFORCEMENT

59.040. Repealed. (Ord No. 140-71;Ord No. 192-73)

59.045. ENFORCEMENT, GENERALLY; RIGHT OF INSPECTION. The building official is hereby authorized and directed to administer and enforce all of the provisions of this chapter. The building official is further authorized to make inspections and reinspections of each building within the scope of this chapter and, in furtherance thereof, to seek inspection warrants pursuant to SRC 2.821 to 2.829. (Ord No. 135-75)

59.050. Repealed. (Ord No. 140-71;Ord No. 192-73)

59.055. RESPONSIBILITY. (a) Notwithstanding any other responsibility imposed upon an occupant pursuant to this chapter, or pursuant to contract or agreement between owner and occupant, every owner remains personally and severally liable for maintaining any Group R-1 or R-3 occupancy owned by him in full compliance with the provisions of this chapter.

(b) Where an owner has appointed an agent or manager with substantial power to act on his behalf in maintaining and supervising the premises of any Group R-1 or R-3 occupancy, any such person shall be personally and severally responsible to the same extent as the owner for maintaining any such occupancy in full compliance with the provisions of this chapter; provided, however, such manager shall have no responsibility to make any alterations or repairs to a building in direct disobedience of the written direction of the owner who employs him.

(c) Where the premises are owned by an estate, a trust, a person whose assets are in receivership, a ward whose assets are subject to a guardianship or conservatorship, or any other person or entity subject of some similar legal disability whose assets are being administered by a fiduciary, the trustee, administrator, personal representative, receiver, guardian, conservator, or other fiduciary responsible for administering the assets shall be personally and severally responsible to the same extent as the owner for maintaining any Group R-1 or R-3 occupancy which is one of the assets in full compliance with the provisions of this chapter; provided, however, such person shall have no responsibility to make any alterations or repairs to a building in disobedience of any written order of a court having jurisdiction over the assets.

(d) Every occupant of a Group R-1 or R-3 occupancy who is not the owner or other responsible person as defined in subsections (b) or (c) of this section, shall be personally and severally responsible for maintaining those portions of the premises occupied by him in full compliance with the provisions of this chapter; provided, however, no such occupant shall be responsible for making any alterations or repairs for which a permit is required pursuant to any provision in Title V of this Code. (Ord No. 135-75;Ord No. 14-81)

59.060. Repealed. (Ord No. 192-73)

59.065. CORRECTION NOTICE AND ORDER. Whenever the building official or any of his inspectors has determined, after inspection, that any of the provisions of SRC 59.145 to 59.290 is not met by a particular building within the scope of this chapter, he shall cause a notice and order to be issued and served as provided in SRC 59.075. The notice and order shall be dated, and shall contain:

(a) The names of any of the persons responsible pursuant to SRC 59.055 to whom the notice and order are directed;

(b) The street address of the premises upon which the building is located;

(c) A designation sufficient to identify any separate dwelling unit in a multiunit building to which the notice and order applies;

(d) A designation of the building's occupancy classificaton;

(e) A brief description of the condition or conditions which do not conform to the requirements of SRC 59.145 to 59.290;

(f) A general description of corrective action necessary to make the building conform to such provisions, and a statement as to whether or not a permit will be required for such work;

(g) An order requiring that such corrections be made and approved by the building official within 180 days of the date of service of the notice and order;

(h) An order requiring that all required permits be obtained within 30 days of the date of service of the notice and order;

(i) A notice that in lieu of making any corrections, the owner may cause the building to be demolished and the premises made safe and sanitary as required by the provisions of this Code, provided that permits are obtained and the work is completed within the above time limits.

(j) A notice in substantially the following form:

YOU HAVE A RIGHT TO APPEAL

You may appeal this notice and order to the Community Development Board of Appeals by filing written Notice of Appeal with the building official of the City of Salem within 30 days of the date this notice and order was served on you. Failure to appeal within that time forfeits your right of appeal, unless the Community Development Board of Appeals, for good cause shown, extends the time for appeal.

(k) The signature of the building official or inspector acting under his jurisdiction;

(l) The date upon which the premises were last inspected. (Ord No. 135-75)

59.070. Repealed. (Ord No. 140-71;Ord No. 192-73)

59.075. SERVICE OF NOTICE AND ORDER. A copy of the notice and order shall be served on the person responsible by either personal service or registered mail sent to the person's last known address. Refusal to accept personal service or registered mail shall be deemed adequate service under this section, and the person so refusing shall be, in all respects, bound to comply with the notice and order. (Ord No. 135-75)

59.080. Repealed. (Ord No. 177-69;Ord No. 192-73)

59.085. EFFECT OF DEFECTIVE OR INCOMPLETE SERVICE. (a) A notice and order which substantially conforms to the requirements of SRC 59.065, though defective in a matter of form not affecting the substance thereof, or the substantial rights of the persons responsible, shall be deemed adequate and effective.

(b) A substantial defect in the notice and order, or in service of the notice and order, may later be corrected by the building official, and the time limits for compliance, permits, and appeal shall commence to run from the date the defect was cured and served on the persons responsible.

(c) A notice and order properly served upon one of the persons responsible shall be valid, effective, and enforceable as against him notwithstanding any defect in or failure to serve a notice and order upon other responsible persons. (Ord No. 135-75)

PERMITS AND INSPECTIONS

59.090. Repealed. (Ord No. 140-71;Ord No. 192-73)

59.092.FHA INSPECTION FEE. Whenever a city inspection is performed in connection with a Federal Housing Administration loan there shall be charged a $100 inspection fee. (Ord No. 54-86)

59.095. FINAL ORDERS. (a) As used in this chapter, and particularly SRC 59.990, the term "final order" means a notice and order which has not been appealed within the time provided in SRC 59.105; or, having been appealed, has been sustained or modified by the board and has not been further appealed to the common council within the time provided in SRC 4.070; or, having been sustained or modified by the board on appeal, and having been further appealed to the common council, has been sustained or modified by council.

(b) The term "final order" also includes a determination by the Community Development Board of Appeals upon a "show cause citation" issued pursuant to SRC 4.035 which has not been appealed to the common council within the time provided in SRC 4.070; or, having been appealed, has been sustained or modified by council. (Ord No. 135-75)

59.100. Repealed. (Ord No. 140-71;Ord No. 48-73;Ord No. 192-73)

59.105. APPEALS. (a) Any person upon whom a notice and order is served pursuant to SRC 59.095, shall have the right to appeal from the notice and order to the Community Development Board of Appeals by filing written notice of appeal with the building official within 30 days of service of the notice and order, or correction pursuant to SRC 59.085.

(b) Appeals shall be heard and disposed of as provided in chapter 4 of this Code.

(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of SRC 4.040, the board may extend the time for appeal by no more than 60 days upon good cause shown. (Ord No. 135-75)

59.110. Repealed. (Ord No. 140-71;Ord No. 192-73)

59.112. Repealed. (Ord No. 108-71;Ord No. 192-73)

59.115. GROUNDS FOR APPEAL. The appellant shall specify one or more of the following grounds in taking appeal as provided in SRC 4.040:

(a) An erroneous finding of fact by the building official or inspector;

(b) An erroneous interpretation or application of a particular provision of SRC 59.145 to 59.290 by the building official or inspector.

(c) An erroneous judgment of the building official or inspector as to approvals required under this chapter.

(d) An alternate material, method of construction, safety measure or like alternative to the specific provision cited by the building official or inspector, which alternative accomplishes the purpose and intent of the provision cited, and is, in all respects, its equal or better in according fire protection, safety, durability, sanitation, and strength in the particular application proposed by the appellant.

(e) The time limits set forth in the notice and order are unreasonable as applied to the appellant, and represent an undue hardship where a specific extension thereof would permit and encourage required corrections to be made within a reasonable time, and would not substantially increase the risk of harm to persons or irreparable property damage or deterioration. Indefinite extensions shall not be granted, nor shall extensions of time be used as a means of waiving the requirements of this chapter. (Ord No. 135-75)

DEFINITIONS

59.120. Repealed. (Ord No. 140-71;Ord No. 192-73)

59.125. GROUP R-1 OCCUPANCY CERTIFICATES, GENERALLY. (a) After inspection, when it is determined that a Group R-1 occupancy satisfies all applicable requirements of this chapter, the building official shall issue a Certificate of Inspection which shall contain the following:

(1) The address of the building.

(2) The name and address of the owner.

(3) A description of that portion of the building for which the certificate is issued.

(4) A statement that the described portion of the building complies with the requirements of this chapter for Group R-1 occupancy, and the specific use for which the occupancy is classified.

(5) The signature of the building official.

(6) The occupant load.
(7) The fire zone in which the building is located.
(8) The date of inspection upon which the certificate is based.

(b) The Certificate of Inspection shall be posted and maintained in a conspicuous place on the premises by the persons responsible under SRC 59.055.

(c) It shall be unlawful for any person to cause, suffer, or permit the use or occupancy of any dwelling unit or guest room in a Group R-1 occupancy at any time when the inspection certificate issued under this section is not displayed as herein required, or when such certificate has been revoked as provided in SRC 59.135. (Ord No. 135-75;Ord No. 14-81)

SPACE AND OCCUPANCY STANDARDS

59.130. Repealed. (Ord No. 177-69;Ord No. 140-71;Ord No. 192-73)

59.135. EFFECT OF CERTIFICATE; REINSPECTION. (a) The issuance of a Certificate of Inspection shall be conclusive evidence that as of the date of inspection appearing thereon the building was constructed and maintained in compliance with the provisions of this chapter.

(b) Notwithstanding the issuance of a Certificate of Inspection, the authority of the building official to inspect premises within the scope of this chapter shall remain undiminished and in effect to the same extent as though such certificate had not been issued.

(c) If any reinspection discloses any condition upon the premises which does not conform to the requirements of this chapter, the building official may revoke and remove the Certificate of Inspection, and issue a notice and order as provided in SRC 59.065; provided, however, that any condition approved through the appeal process as provided in SRC 59.105 shall not thereafter be cited as a violation if it has been maintained in at least as safe, sound, and sanitary a condition as existed at the time of the appeal, and has not been materially altered.

(d) If any reinspection discloses that the building continues to conform to the requirements of this chapter, the building official shall remove the Certificate of Inspection and issue a new one as provided in SRC 59.125. (Ord No. 135-75)

59.140. Repealed. (Ord No. 177-69;Ord No. 140-71;Ord No. 192-73)

CONSTRUCTION AND OCCUPANCY REQUIREMENTS

59.145. STRUCTURAL REQUIREMENTS. (a) Buildings or structures may be of any type of construction permitted by the UBC. Roofs, floors, walls, fireplaces, chimneys, foundations and all other structural components of buildings shall be capable of resisting any and all forces and loads to which they may be subjected. All structural elements shall be proportioned and joined in accordance with the design criteria specified in the appropriate sections of the UBC.

(b) All wood shall be protected against insect damage and other decay. Exterior surfaces shall be protected in an approved manner from damage resulting from moisture penetration.

(c) Access to all attic and underfloor areas shall be provided by means of openings not less than 14 inches by 24 inches in size. (Ord No. 135-75)

59.150. Repealed. (Ord No. 177-69;Ord No. 140-71;Ord No. 192-73)

59.155. FIRE-RESISTIVE SEPARATION. (a) When a building is used for more than one occupancy purpose, each part of the building comprising a distinct "occupancy," as described in Table 5-A of the UBC, shall be separated from each other occupancy in the building by not less than a "One Hour Fire-Resistive Occupancy Separation" meeting the requirements for such occupancy separations specified in the UBC. (See UBC Sec. 503(c) and UBC Ch. 43 for detailed requirements.)

(b) In Group R-1 occupancies, each room containing a boiler or central heating plant shall be separated from the rest of the building by not less than a "One Hour Fire-Resistive Occupancy Separation" as specified in subsection (a) of this section.

(c) An approved fire sprinkler system may be used in lieu of fire-resistive separation as otherwise required by this section. (Ord No. 135-75;Ord No. 14-81)

59.160. Repealed. (Ord No. 177-69;Ord No. 140-71;Ord No. 192-73)

59.165. OCCUPANCY LOAD. (a) The occupancy load for any Group R-1 or R-3 occupancy shall be determined by dividing the total superficial floor area of the occupancy by 200, and rounding any fraction to the next higher whole number.

(b) A building within the scope of this chapter shall not be used, designed, or equipped for use by or for more occupants than the occupancy load determined under subsection (a) of this section. (Ord No. 135-75;Ord No. 14-81)

59.170. Repealed. (Ord No. 192-73)

EXITS, DOORS, AND STAIRWAYS

59.175. EXITS, GENERALLY. (a) Each habitable room shall be served by at least one exit meeting the requirements of this chapter.

(b) Each sleeping room shall have at least one window or door approved for emergency egress or rescue unless the room is served by an approved fire warning system meeting the requirements of UBC Sec. 1310(a) or 1413 as applicable. A window with a net clear openable area of not less than five square feet, no dimension less than 22 inches and a sill not more than 48 inches above the floor shall be deemed to meet the requirements of this subsection.

(c) In buildings housing more than one dwelling unit, each dwelling unit shall be served by an exit which does not pass through any other dwelling unit. As used in this subsection, foyers, entrance halls, lobbies, common corridors, yards, or courts to which all tenants served thereby have unrestricted access shall not be considered as part of any single dwelling unit.

(d) No part of any required exit shall be less than 28 inches in clear, openable width; nor less than six feet six inches in clear height except as provided for stairways under SRC 59.215 and 59.225.

(e) No obstructions shall be placed in the required width of an exit except such projections as are permitted by this chapter or chapter 33 of the UBC. (Ord No. 135-75)

STRUCTURAL REQUIREMENTS

59.180. Repealed. (Ord No. 177-69;Ord No. 307;Ord No. 140-71;Ord No. 192-73)

59.185. ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR EXITS IN GROUP R-1 OCCUPANCIES. (a) A Group R-1 occupancy shall have not less than the number of exits required by UBC Sec. 3302(a).

(b) No part of any required exit in a Group R-1 occupancy shall be less than the width provided under UBC Sec. 3302(b).

(c) Where more than one exit is required they shall be so arranged and spaced that if one is blocked, the occupants of each sleeping room have reasonable access to another exit.

(d) The maximum distance of travel from any point to an exterior exit door, horizontal exit, exit passageway, or enclosed stairway in a building not equipped with an automatic fire extinguishing system throughout shall not exceed 150 feet.

(e) All exitways serving more than one dwelling unit or guest room shall be adequately lighted at all times, with light having an intensity of not less than one foot candle at floor level. (Ord No. 135-75;Ord No. 14-81)

MECHANICAL REQUIREMENTS

59.190. Repealed. (Ord No. 140-71;Ord No. 192-73)

59.195. DOORS, GENERALLY. (a) There shall be a floor or landing on each side of any door. The floor or landing shall be not more than one-half inch lower than the threshold of the doorway. Where a door opens over a landing, no dimension of the landing shall be less than the width of the door, or three feet, whichever is greater.

(b) Notwithstanding subsection (a) of this section, in Group R-3 occupancies and within individual units of Group R-1 occupancies, a door may open on the top step of a flight of stairs or on an exterior landing provided the door does not swing over the top step or exterior landing, and the landing is not more than seven and one-half inches below the level of the floor on the opposite side of the doorway.

(c) Doors which are part of a required exitway shall be so finished or marked that they are readily distinguishable from the adjacent construction. (Ord No. 135-75;Ord No. 14-81)

EXITS

59.200. Repealed. (Ord No. 177-69;Ord No. 140-71;Ord No. 192-73)

59.205. ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR DOORS IN GROUP R-1 OCCUPANCIES. (a) Exit doors shall swing in the direction of exit travel when serving any hazardous area or when serving an occupant load of 50 or more.

(b) Double acting doors shall not be used in exits serving a tributary occupant load of more than 100; nor shall they be used as part of a fire assembly, nor equipped with panic hardware. Except within individual dwelling units in apartment houses, and guest rooms in hotels, double acting doors shall be provided with a view panel of not less than 200 square inches.

(c) Exit doors shall be openable from the inside without the use of a key or any special knowledge or effort.

(d) Glass doors shall conform to the requirements specified in UBC Sec. 5406.

(e) Every doorway in a required exit shall be of a size such as to permit the installation of a door not less than three feet in width and not less than six feet eight inches in height. Doors installed therein shall be capable of opening at least 90 degrees and shall be so mounted that the clear width of the exitway is not less than 28 inches. In computing the exit width required under subsection (b) of SRC 59.185, the net dimension of the exitway shall be used.

(f) The ceiling height of every room, corridor, or other portion of the building forming part of a required exit shall be not less than six feet ten inches, except as provided for stairways under SRC 59.215.

(g) No leaf of an exit door shall exceed four feet in width.

(h) Revolving, sliding, and overhead doors shall not be used in required exits. Approved power operated doors may be used for exit purposes. (Ord No. 135-75;Ord No. 14-81)

FIRE PROTECTION

59.210. Repealed. (Ord No. 177-69;Ord No. 140-71;Ord No. 192-73)

59.215. STAIRWAYS IN GROUP R-1 OCCUPANCIES. (a) All stairways in Group R-1 occupancies shall conform to the requirements of UBC Sec. 3305 except that the following exemptions are allowed in the case of stairways constructed prior to September 9, 1975, and which have not been altered since that date:

(1) Headroom clearance of not less than five feet ten inches is permitted if approved protective padding is applied to the soffit above, and any projection which reduces headroom clearance to less than six feet six inches is lighted and is marked or otherwise finished so as to readily distinguish it from adjacent construction.

(2) Tread and riser dimensions of the bottom step of a stairway which falls within the exception to UBC Sec. 3305(c) may vary from the dimensions of the next higher step by a tolerance of not more than two inches. Such exception shall also apply to exterior concrete stairways, whether or not private, which do not have more than five steps.

(b) Handrails shall be installed and maintained in a safe and usable condition, capable of withstanding all forces and loads to which they may be subjected in normal and panic situations.

(c) This section shall not apply to stairways or ladders serving only unfinished attics, basements, or cellars, none of which contains a habitable room, bathroom, toilet compartment, laundry room, workshop, playroom, or other similar regularly used area. See SRC 59.235 for guardrail requirements. (Ord No. 135-75;Ord No. 14-81)

SUBSTANDARD BUILDINGS

59.220. Repealed. (Ord No. 19-68;Ord No. 54-68;Ord No. 177-69;Ord No. 140-71;Ord No. 192-73)

59.225. STAIRWAYS IN GROUP R-3 OCCUPANCIES. (a) Stairways shall be not less than 28 inches in width; except that stairways to basements or attics, neither of which contains a sleeping room, shall have not less than 24 inches unobstructed width. Handrails shall not reduce the width of any stairway by more than four inches.

(b) The rise of every step in a stairway shall not exceed nine inches and the run shall be not less than eight inches. The run of treads and the height of risers within any flight shall have uniform dimensions within a one-half inch tolerance. Tread and riser dimensions of the bottom step of a stairway may vary from the dimensions of the next higher step by a tolerance of not more than two inches.

(c) At least one handrail shall be provided for each stairway having more than three risers. Stairways having more than three risers and open on one or both sides shall have one handrail on each open side. Handrails shall be placed not less than 28 nor more than 36 inches above the nosing of the treads. All handrails shall be installed and maintained in a safe and usable condition, capable of withstanding the forces and loads to which they may be subjected in both normal and panic situations.

(d) Each stairway shall have a headroom clearance of not less than six feet six inches; provided, however, that headroom clearance of not less than five feet six inches is permitted if approved protective padding is applied to the soffit above, and any protection which reduces headroom clearance to less than six feet six inches is lighted and is marked or otherwise finished so as to readily distinguish it from adjacent construction.

(e) This section shall not apply to stairways serving only unfinished attics, basements, or cellars, none of which contains a habitable room, bathroom, toilet compartment, laundry room, workshop, playroom, or other similar regularly used area. See SRC 59.235 for guardrail requirements. (Ord No. 135-75;Ord No. 115-76;Ord No. 14-81)

59.235. GUARDRAILS. (a) All unenclosed floor and roof openings; open and glazed sides of landings; balconies and porches which are more than 30 inches above grade; and roofs used as patios, decks, or similar service, and not exclusively for service of the building, shall be protected by guardrails not less than 32 inches in height. Guardrails shall not be so constructed that no object nine inches or more in diameter can pass through, and shall be maintained in a safe and usable condition, capable of withstanding all forces and loads to which they may be subjected in normal and panic situations.

(b) Porches not more than five feet above grade and provided with a combination bench and guardrail enclosure not less than 24 inches high and seven and one-half inches wide at the top shall not be required to meet the requirements of subsection (a) of this section. (Ord No. 135-75)

ELECTRICAL, HEATING, AND VENTILATION REQUIREMENTS

59.240. ELECTRICAL REQUIREMENTS. (a) All electrical equipment, wiring, and appliances shall be installed and maintained in a safe manner in accordance with the NEC. All electrical equipment shall be of an approved type.

(b) Every habitable room shall contain at least two supplied electric convenience outlets, or one supplied electric convenience outlet and one supplied electric light fixture. (Ord No. 135-75)

59.250. LIGHTING REQUIREMENTS. (a) Each habitable room, bathroom, and water closet compartment shall be provided with natural light by means of windows or skylights with an area of not less than five square feet for each 100 square feet of superficial floor area or fraction thereof.

(b) In lieu of natural light as provided in subsection (a) of this section, interior rooms, bathrooms, and water closet compartments may be provided with artificial light equivalent to one

40 watt incandescent bulb for each 100 square feet of superficial floor area or fraction thereof, provided the light is so located as to illuminate all foot traffic areas of the room and the interior of any tub or shower stall with light having an intensity of one foot candle at floor level.

(c) Each laundry room, utility room, storage room, closet, workshop, service room, and cellar having more than 20 square feet of superficial floor area shall be provided with natural or artificial light, or any combination thereof, equivalent to that specified in subsection (a) or (b) of this section. (Ord No. 135-75)

59.260. HEATING REQUIREMENTS. (a) Every dwelling unit and guest room shall be provided with comfort heating facilities capable of maintaining a temperature of 60 degrees Farenheit at a point three feet above the floor in all habitable rooms. All heating devices or applicances shall be of an approved type.

(b) Combustion air for fuel burning appliances shall be provided as required in the UMC.

(c) All fuel burning appliances shall be installed and maintained in accordance with the provisions of all applicable Codes. Unvented fuel-burning heaters are prohibited. (Ord No. 135-75)

59.270. VENTILATION REQUIREMENTS. Each habitable room, bathroom, and water closet compartment shall be equipped with openable windows, openable skylights, a mechanical ventilation system, or any combination thereof capable of producing at least two air changes per hour. Openable windows or skylights with an area at least one-twentieth the superficial floor area of the room, but in no event less than five square feet, shall be deemed to satisfy the requirements of this section. (Ord No. 135-75)

SANITATION REQUIREMENTS

59.280. SANITATION REQUIREMENTS, GENERALLY. (a) Every dwelling unit shall be provided with a water closet, a lavatory, and a bathtub or shower.

(b) Each dwelling unit shall be provided with kitchen facilities complete with kitchen sink. Such facility shall be separate from the lavatory, bath, and toilet facilities required under subsection (a) of this section.

(c) All plumbing fixtures shall be drained into an approved sanitary sewer or private sewage disposal system in conformance with the UPC. All plumbing fixtures shall be provided with hot and cold running water from an approved water supply system; provided, however, that water closets may be supplied with cold water only. All plumbing fixtures shall be of approved nonabsorbant materials.

(d) Any room in which a water closet is located shall be separated from kitchen facilities, food preparation, and food storage areas by a tight-fitting door.

(e) All sanitary facilities, drain, waste, vent, and water piping shall be of approved materials, and shall be installed and maintained in a safe and sanitary condition, free from cross-connections and syphonage between fixtures, and free from any other condition which would allow impure water to enter the potable water supply system. (Ord No. 135-75)

59.290. ADDITIONAL SANITATION REQUIREMENTS FOR GROUP R-1 OCCUPANCIES. (a) In hotels where private water closets, lavatories, and baths are not provided for each guest room, there shall be provided on each floor for each sex at least one water closet, one lavatory, and one bath accessible from a public hallway. Additional lavatories, water closets, and baths shall be provided at the rate of one each for each sex per every ten potential guests, or fraction thereof, in excess of ten. Such facilities shall be clearly marked for "men" or "women."

(b) Walls and floors of water closet compartments shall be finished with approved nonabsorbent materials. Carpeting with a nonabsorbent backing may be used as a floor covering if maintained in a sanitary condition. (Ord No. 135-75;Ord No. 14-81)

59.300. to 59.980. Reserved for Expansion.

VIOLATIONS

59.990 VIOLATIONS. (a) Within the limits of responsibility set forth in SRC 59.055, no person, firm, or corporation shall use, occupy or maintain any Group R-1 or R-3 occupancy contrary to or in violation of any final administrative order entered pursuant to the provisions of this chapter.

(b) No person, firm, or corporation, whether or not responsible under SRC 59.055, shall knowingly cause or permit any person, firm, or corporation to use, occupy, or maintain any Group R-1 or R-3 occupancy in violation of subsection (a) of this section.

(c) Violation of this section is an infraction. (Ord No. 135-75;Ord No. 193-79;Ord No. 14-81)

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
Office of Community Planning and Development

The HOME Program

HOME Investment Partnerships

Program Guide

HOME can be a useful tool to expand the availability of affordable housing for low-income families. The Administration worked closely with Congress to ensure the effective targeting of the program to families with the most severe housing needs, and to ensure that funds would be available for the most effective uses. In particular, the graduated match creates important incentives for tenant-based assistance and rehabilitation as the most cost-effective, timely, and choice-enhancing methods of expanding affordable housing. The HOME Program promises to be a new partnership between States, localities and nonprofits to help low-income families gain access to decent housing and experience the pride of ownership.

Secretary Jack Kemp
U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

TABLE OF CONTENTS

HOME INVESTMENT PARTNERSHIPS PROGRAM

WHAT IS HOME?

The HOME Program was created under Title II (the Home Investment Partnerships Act) of the National Affordable Housing Act of 1990. The general purposes of HOME include:

- To expand the supply of decent and affordable housing, particularly rental housing, for low- and very low-income Americans. Such housing includes existing rental housing made affordable through tenant-based rental assistance.

- To strengthen the abilities of State and local governments to design and implement strategies for achieving adequate supplies of decent, affordable housing.

- To provide both financial and technical assistance to participating jurisdictions, including the development of model programs for affordable low-income housing.

- To extend and strengthen partnerships among all levels of government and the private sector, including for-profit and nonprofit organizations, in the production and operation of affordable housing.

The HOME Program is not a categorical housing program, such as public housing new construction, requiring a specific housing activity. Instead, the HOME program provides States and local governments flexibility to decide what kind of housing assistance, or mix of housing assistance, is most appropriate to meet their housing needs.

As part of a Federal strategy to encourage States and local governments to use HOME funds most efficiently, the most cost-effective housing activities (tenant-based assistance, acquisition, and low-cost rehabilitation) require the smallest State and local matching contribution for Federal funds. (See Matching Funds Requirement, page 11.)

WHY HOME?

HOME affirms the Federal government's commitment to provide decent, safe and affordable housing to all Americans, and to alleviate the problems of excessive rent burdens, homelessness and deteriorating housing stock in the nation. As recommended by the National Housing Task Force in 1988, HOME provides funding and general guidelines to State and local governments and empowers them to design and tailor affordable housing strategies to address local needs and housing conditions. HOME strives to meet both the short-term goal of increasing the supply and availability of affordable housing, and the long-term goal of building partnerships between State and local governments and private and nonprofit organizations and strengthening their capacity to meet the housing needs of low- and very low-income residents. The graduated match provides incentives to use HOME funds for tenant-based assistance and low-cost rehabilitation.

WHO CAN PARTICIPATE IN THE HOME PROGRAM?

All States, as well as metropolitan cities, urban counties and consortia (contiguous units of local government), are eligible to become participating jurisdictions in the HOME Program. Additionally a special set-aside of funds is made for Indian tribes.

HOW DO JURISDICTIONS APPLY FOR HOME FUNDS?

Before receiving HOME funds, a jurisdiction must prepare (and HUD must approve) a Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS), submit a notice of intent to participate and provide a program description. The following documents and steps are required:

The CHAS

The Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS), prepared by the participating jurisdiction, will document housing needs and the State's or community's strategic plan to address those needs. It will consist of tabular and narrative data, which encompass the fourteen elements required by the National Affordable Housing Act, described in detail at 24 CFR Part 91. These data are presented in three parts with a total of five component elements:

I. State or Community Profile/Needs Assessment
   1. Household Needs Assessment
   2. Market and Inventory Conditions;

II. Five year Strategy
   3. Strategies

III. One year Plan/Annual Update
   4. Resources
   5. Investment Plan and Goals

An applicant's CHAS is due by October 31 each year. The first CHAS submitted must cover 5 years. Annual updates are due on October 31 of each subsequent year. HUD will approve a CHAS within 60 days of receipt unless the CHAS is inconsistent with the purposes of the National Affordable Housing Act, or information has not been provided in a substantially complete manner. If a jurisdiction's CHAS is disapproved, it may resubmit its revised CHAS within 45 days. HUD then has 30 days to approve or disapprove it. HUD will monitor compliance with the CHAS and provide the jurisdiction with its evaluation annually.

Notice of Intent to Participate

Twenty days after HOME funds become available each year, HUD will publish a Federal Register Notice of Fund Availability (NOFA). Within 30 days of the NOFA publication, each eligible jurisdiction must notify HUD of its intent to participate in the HOME Program.

Participating Jurisdiction Designation

HUD will designate the applicant as a participating jurisdiction after the notice of intent has been received and HUD has approved its CHAS.

Program Description

Within 45 days of its designation, or 45 days after the publication of the NOFA, whichever is later, a participating jurisdiction must submit a program description to HUD for approval. It must include the following information:

- For local governments, the estimated use of HOME funds and matching funds for each eligible activity;
- For States, a description of how it plans to distribute HOME funds;
- The amount of HOME funds that will be reserved for community housing development organizations (CHDOs) and a description of how the participating jurisdiction will work with the CHDOs;
- Certifications regarding the use of HOME funds for new construction and compliance with other statutory requirements and Federal laws; and
- Certification of compliance with its CHAS.

HUD will approve the program description within 30 days unless (1) the information provided is insufficient, or (2) the proposed use of funds is inconsistent with the participating jurisdiction's CHAS. HUD may approve the program description conditionally and request additional information or request that the participating jurisdiction revise and resubmit its description.

HOME Investment Trust Fund

HUD will establish an account with a line of credit for each participating jurisdiction whose CHAS and program description are approved. This account is called the Home Investment Trust Fund (HITF). All funds drawn from the HITF must be used to develop affordable housing based on participating jurisdiction's approved housing strategy.

HOW ARE HOME FUNDS ALLOCATED?

Indian Tribe Set-aside

One percent of all HOME funds is reserved for Indian tribes, to be distributed on a competitive basis. In lieu of a housing strategy, applicants will demonstrate how the project(s) will contribute to a comprehensive approach for expanding the supply of affordable housing for members of the Indian tribe. Projects will be selected based on the relative adequacy in addressing locally determined need.

Technical Assistance Set-aside

$25 million will be set-aside for technical assistance and building the capacity of nonprofit sponsors. Of these funds, $14 million will be allocated to national and statewide intermediary organizations to provide technical assistance to CHDOs. The remaining $11 million will be utilized to provide technical assistance to participating jurisdictions.

Formula Allocations

The balance of HOME funds is allocated by formula, with 60 percent of these funds available for metropolitan cities, urban counties and consortia and 40 percent for States. Each participating jurisdiction will be required to set aside 15 percent of its formula allocation for development of projects owned, developed or sponsored by CHDOs.

Basis of the Formula. The formula is based on six statutory factors established to reflect a jurisdiction's need for an increased supply of affordable housing for low- and very low-income families. The formula measures a jurisdiction's relative inadequacy of housing supply, substandard housing, number of low-income families in housing units likely to be in need of rehabilitation, cost of producing housing, poverty, and fiscal incapacity to carry out housing activities without Federal assistance.

Allocations to States. States who meet the application requirements for the HOME Program will receive their formula allocation or $3,000,000, whichever is greater. In addition, the allocation for those States with no local governments receiving HOME allocations will be increased by $500,000.

Allocations to Units of General Local Government. Jurisdictions whose share of funds under the formula would be less than $500,000 are not offered an allocation and cannot apply for HOME funds directly. They may, however, participate in the State program. Those jurisdictions whose formula allocation is $750,000 or more are automatically eligible to apply for HOME funds.

Those with allocations between $500,000 and $750,000 are eligible to apply only if they provide funds to fill the "gap" up to the $750,000 threshold. These funds can be local or State funds. No Federal funds can be used to fill this gap. However, the State may choose to transfer a portion of its own HOME allocation to the locality. This gap needs to be filled only in the first year of participation in the HOME Program.

WHAT ARE THE REQUIREMENTS FOR FORMING A CONSORTIUM?

A group of local governments may choose to form a consortium, particularly when one or more members are not eligible to receive a formula allocation, or their formula allocation would not meet the minimum threshold for funding. A consortium must:

- o comprise contiguous units of local government;
- o provide HUD a notice of intent to form a consortium by March 31 of the year prior to

funding (i.e., Fiscal Year 1993 consortia requests are submitted by March 1992);

- o submit a written certification from the State that the consortium will direct its activities to alleviate housing problems within the State;
- o have a legally binding agreement between participating local governments; and
- o demonstrate sufficient capacity to meet program requirements.

Each local government within the consortium generally must make a three-year commitment to participate. New governments may be added during this period, but none can drop out.

WHAT CAN HOME FUNDS BE USED FOR?

HOME funds may be used for a variety of activities to develop and support affordable housing. Eligible activities include: tenant-based rental assistance, assistance to first-time homebuyers and existing homeowners, property acquisition, new construction, reconstruction, moderate or substantial rehabilitation, site improvements, demolition, relocation expenses and other reasonable and necessary expenses related to development of non-luxury housing.

Tenant-Based Assistance

HOME funds may be used for tenant-based assistance in any participating jurisdiction. The following conditions apply for such use of funds:

- o The participating jurisdiction certifies that such assistance is an essential element of its annual housing strategy and specifies the local market conditions leading to this determination; and
- o The assistance is provided to persons on the Section 8 waiting list of a public housing authority (PHA) operating within the jurisdiction in accordance with federal preferences.

The tenant-based assistance program may be operated by the participating jurisdiction or it may be contracted out to another capable entity (such as a public housing authority). The following requirements govern tenant-based rental assistance:

- o Rental assistance contracts may not exceed 24 months, although they may be renewed.
- o Rents must be reasonable, as compared with comparable unassisted units.
- o Lease requirements must be equitable to the tenant.
- o A participating jurisdiction may not pay more than the difference between a rent standard for the unit size (established by the participating jurisdiction) and 30 percent of the family's monthly adjusted income. This rent standard may not be less than 80 percent of

the Section 8 Existing Housing fair market rent for the unit size, nor more than HUD-approved community-wide exception rent.

- o The participating jurisdiction must require a minimum contribution toward rent for each tenant.

- o Units must meet Section 8 Housing Quality Standards.

Rehabilitation

The HOME Program permits the use of funds for rehabilitation, since low-cost rehabilitation can be a cost effective development strategy. HOME funds may be used for the rehabilitation of both rental and homeowner occupied housing. The statute provides a preference for rehabilitation.

New Construction

Those participating jurisdictions who receive a portion of their allocation as new construction set-aside funds, as determined by HUD's rental housing production formula described below, may use any of their HOME funds for new construction, without meeting additional conditions. Other participating jurisdictions may only use HOME funds for new construction if they meet the criteria for neighborhood revitalization or special housing needs, as outlined below.

Rental Housing Production Set-Aside

Of the HOME funds made available through the basic funding formula, 15 percent will be set aside automatically for funding new construction of rental housing. Approximately 30 percent of all eligible jurisdictions will receive a portion of their total formula allocation through this rental housing production formula. (A participating jurisdiction's share of these set-aside funds may constitute from 10% to 75% of its basic allocation, depending on the relative tightness of its housing market.) Participating jurisdictions will have two years to invest these set-aside funds in new construction or substantial rehabilitation of rental housing. After 24 months, participating jurisdictions may use these funds for other eligible activities, for up to an additional 12 months.

The <u>rental housing production formula</u> determines the participating jurisdiction's need for new construction, relative to other eligible participating jurisdictions. The formula combines several objective measures of inadequate housing supply: low vacancy rates, low turnover of units with rents below fair market rents, a high proportion of substandard housing, high fair market rents, and high population growth.

With the amount of each jurisdiction's formula allocation, HUD will list those jurisdictions which are eligible to use their HOME allocation for new construction of rental housing, and the set-aside amount in the Notice of Fund Availability. For States, HUD will also list all counties in which States may use HOME funds for new construction of rental housing.

Neighborhood Revitalization

New construction is permissible as part of an overall neighborhood revitalization project, when the participating jurisdiction determines and certifies that:

- o Rehabilitation is not the most cost-effective way to meet housing needs to expand the supply of affordable housing in that neighborhood and the participating jurisdiction's housing needs, within the neighborhood, cannot be met through rehabilitation of available stock;

- o The neighborhood revitalization program emphasizes rehabilitation of substandard housing. One accepted measure of such emphasis is a demonstration that at least 51 percent of the funds for the revitalization program were spent on the rehabilitation of substandard housing;

- o The neighborhood is a low-income neighborhood;

- o The housing to be constructed is developed, owned, or sponsored by a CHDO or a public agency; and

- o The number of housing units to be constructed with HOME funds will not exceed 20 percent of the total number of housing units in the neighborhood revitalization program that are assisted with HOME funds (the 20 percent limitation may be exceeded under certain circumstances).

Special Needs

New construction is also permissible to provide housing for those with special needs when the participating jurisdiction determines and certifies that:

- o Rehabilitation of available housing stock is not the most cost-effective way to expand the supply of affordable housing for a particular special needs group and the special needs cannot be met through rehabilitation of the available housing stock;

- o The new housing will:

    - accommodate families with five or more persons,

    - accommodate persons with disabilities,

    - provide single room occupancy housing, or

    - further the desegregation or racial deconcentration of housing within the jurisdiction, pursuant to a court-approved settlement agreement, compliance agreement or voluntary plan approved by HUD if tenant-based assistance is not sufficient to meet the specified need within reasonable time;

- o The approved CHAS adequately documents priority for providing housing to accommodate special needs; and
- o Public housing to meet special needs is unavailable.

WHAT ACTIVITIES ARE PROHIBITED?

HOME funds may not be used to pay for any administrative costs of a participating jurisdiction. Other activities prohibited under the HOME Program include public housing modernization, tenant subsidies for certain special mandated purposes under Section 8, matching funds for other Federal programs, Annual Contributions Contracts (ACCs), activities under the Low-Income Housing Preservation Acts of 1987 and 1990, and operating subsidies for rental housing. Additionally, the funds cannot be used to create a reserve to undertake these activities at a later date.

WHAT WILL ENSURE THAT LOW- AND VERY LOW-INCOME FAMILIES ARE SERVED?

Rental Housing

HOME funds invested in rental housing must meet the following income targeting requirements for the program as a whole:

- o At least 90 percent of such funds must be invested in units that are occupied by families whose incomes do not exceed 60 percent of the median family income for the area; and
- o The remaining funds (up to 10 percent) must be invested in units occupied by families below 80 percent of median income.

Each rental project must meet the following affordability tests:

- o Have rents at or below the <u>lesser</u> of either:
  - the existing Section 8 Fair Market Rent, or
  - 30 percent of the adjusted income of a family whose income equals 65 percent of the median income for the area;
- o Remain affordable for the following terms based on the average HOME subsidy per unit:

Rehabilitation of up to $15,000:	5 years
" " $15,000 - $40,000	10 years
" " $40,000 +	15 years
New construction (any amount)	20 years

- o Have at least 20 percent of its units occupied by very low-income families paying not more than 30 percent of monthly adjusted gross income for rent, or bearing rents not greater than 30 percent of the gross income of a family whose income equals 50 percent of the median income for the area.

Homeownership

All of the HOME funds used for homeownership assistance must benefit first-time homebuyers (including displaced homemakers and single parents who may have once owned a home with a spouse), or existing low-income homeowners whose family incomes are at or below 80% of the area median income. In addition:

- The assisted housing must be the owner's principal residence;
- The purchase price of the property, or the appraised value of a property already owned, after rehabilitation must be less than 95 percent of median area purchase price; and
- Resale of the property by a first-time homebuyer must be restricted to low-income homebuyers at a price that will yield a fair return to the seller and be affordable to the new owner.

Maximum Per Unit Subsidies

To ensure that units developed with HOME funds are non-luxury, affordable units, HUD has established a maximum per unit HOME subsidy on a market-by-market basis, adjusted for unit size, which will be updated and adjusted for inflation annually.

Property Standards

All HOME-assisted units must meet local codes and standards, and, at a minimum, Section 8 Housing Quality Standards.

WHAT OBLIGATIONS DO PARTICIPATING JURISDICTIONS INCUR WHEN ACCEPTING HOME FUNDS?

Matching Funds Requirement

Participating jurisdictions must contribute directly to affordable housing developments assisted with HOME funds. (However, Congress has waived the matching requirement for HOME funds allocated in FY 1992.) The required contribution, or "match," will vary by type of activity for which the HOME funds are utilized:

HOME MATCH RATIOS

ACTIVITY	HOME FUNDS	REQUIRED MATCH
Rehabilitation	4	1
Rental Assistance	4	1
Acquisition (existing housing)	4	1
Substantial Rehabilitation (over $25,000 average per unit)	3	1
New Construction	2	1

Matching funds must be used for HOME-assisted projects, and requirements will be calculated on a project-by-project basis and applied on a program-wide basis. A participating jurisdiction is required to match, by the end of each fiscal year, all HOME funds expended during that year, but is not required to match funds used to fill the gap to meet the $750,000 threshold unless the State transfers its funds to a local jurisdiction. Each participating jurisdiction will be automatically credited 7 percent of its allocation as a match for its administrative costs (but no administrative costs above that amount are eligible sources of match). A participating jurisdiction incurs a "match liability" each time it draws funds from its HOME Investment Trust Fund. The match payment must be expended by the end of each fiscal year, September 30th.

Sources of Matching Funds

As a general rule of thumb, investments which are genuine contributions from the State/local government or private sources will be eligible to qualify as a matching contribution.

Eligible sources of match include cash; the value of foregone interest, taxes, fees or charges; appraised value of land or real property; investments in on- or off-site improvements; and up to 7 percent of each year's allocation expended on administration.

Ineligible match sources include: Federal funds, market rate loans, value of Federal tax credits, owner- and sweat- equity and in-kind contributions. While CDBG funds may otherwise not be counted towards the match, they may be counted as (up to 7 percent of HOME allocations) part of the match for administrative costs.

Building Partnerships with Nonprofit Organizations

Each participating jurisdiction receiving HOME funds is required to reserve at least 15 percent of the funds for housing to be developed, sponsored or owned by CHDOs. A CHDO is a private, nonprofit organization which:

- o has among its purposes, the provision of decent housing that is affordable to low-income and moderate-income persons;
- o has demonstrated its capacity for carrying out activities assisted with HOME funds;
- o has a history of serving the community within which the housing to be assisted with HOME funds is to be located;
- o is organized under State or local laws;
- o has standards of financial accountability; and
- o has a tax exemption under section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code.

To maintain accountability to low-income community residents, at least one-third of a CHDO's governing board must be low-income residents or elected representatives of such residents. CHDOs must maintain a formal process for low-income residents and program beneficiaries to advise the organization on relevant decisions. A CHDO cannot be a public body, nor be controlled by, or under the direction of, individuals or entities seeking to derive profit or gain from the organization. A CHDO may be sponsored or created by a for-profit entity if:

(1) the primary purpose of the for-profit entity is not the development or management of housing;

(2) the for-profit entity does not have the right to appoint more than one-third of the membership of the organization's governing body; and

(3) the CHDO is free to contract for goods and services from vendors of its own choosing.

Up to 10 percent of a participating jurisdiction's CHDO set-aside may be used for project-specific technical assistance, site control and seed money loans. Any portion of the 15 percent of a participating jurisdiction's allocation which is not reserved for CHDOs within the 18-month period after they have been made available, will be deducted from that jurisdiction's HOME allocation and reallocated to other jurisdictions for use by CHDOs.

WHAT ACTIVITIES WILL HUD UNDERTAKE TO ENSURE THE SUCCESSFUL IMPLEMENTATION OF THE HOME PROGRAM?

Model Programs

HUD will be actively involved in designing model programs which meet the requirements of the HOME program in conjunction with participating jurisdictions, nonprofit organizations, members of the private sector and others who are developing housing. HUD will disseminate information about model programs which have been developed, so that they might be adopted or adapted by States and local communities.

Technical Assistance

HUD will develop and administer a technical assistance program to expand the capacity of State and local governments as well as nonprofit housing developers.

Monitoring and Evaluation

HUD will work closely with participating jurisdictions to ensure compliance with HOME requirements and other relevant federal regulations. Participating jurisdictions will certify to HUD tenant incomes, rent levels, and subsidy levels, as appropriate. HOME activities will be monitored in relation to the participating jurisdiction's CHAS and Program Description.

For more information about the HOME Program, contact:

Office of Affordable Housing Programs
U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
451 Seventh Street, SW
Washington, D.C. 20410

City of Keizer
930 Chemawa Rd. N.E. • P.O. Box 21000
Keizer, Oregon 97307-1000 • (503) 390-3700 • Fax # 393-9437

CITY COUNCIL MEETING: June 21, 1993

AGENDA ITEM NUMBER: 8d

TO: MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL

THROUGH: DOTTY TRYK Dotty
CITY MANAGER

FROM: JOHN N. MORGAN, AICP
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR

SUBJECT: PROPOSED LIGHTING OF KEIZER LITTLE LEAGUE FIELD

ISSUE:

Shall the City Council initiate a conditional use permit application and revisions to the Parks Regulations to allow installation of field lights at Keizer Little League Park?

DISCUSSION:

The Keizer Little League is planning to install field lights at the Keizer Little League Park, which is owned by the City of Keizer. The Park is zoned P (PUBLIC). This zone requires conditional use approval for the installation of new park facilities or the expansion of existing ones. The proposed field lights are "accessory" to the existing ball fields and will not establish new uses at the park. However, Staff finds installation of the lights can significantly change the way the fields are used and how neighboring properties can be impacted. As such, review and approval through the conditional use process is appropriate. As the City is the owner, the City must file the application. Keizer Little League has indicated it will provide the background information for the conditional use and will advocate for the use during the hearings process.

Decisions on conditional use applications are usually made at the Staff level, with appeal to the Hearings Officer, and then to the City Council. However, in cases where the property in question is owned by the City (such as the old Keizer School on Fernwood Park), issues are referred directly to the Council for consideration. This helps avoid any perception of possible staff bias in reviewing land use actions on City held property. The Council is being asked, by approval of this staff report, to authorize Staff to prepare and file the conditional use application and to set the matter for public hearing on July 19, 1993 or as soon thereafter as possible.

In a companion issue, the Parks Regulations need to be amended to accommodate this proposal. The regulations currently close all parks at sundown. With lighting, the use of the park will obviously extend into the evening. The Council is also asked to direct staff to prepare draft regulation amendments addressing this issue.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

It is recommended Council:

1. Direct staff to prepare and file a conditional use application for the installation of lights at Keizer Little League Park;

2. Direct staff to set a public hearing before the Council for consideration of the proposed conditional use; and

3. Direct staff to prepare draft amendments to the Parks Regulations to allow operation of the Keizer Little League fields after dark and to bring the amendments to the Council for consideration at the same time the conditional use is considered.

Attachments:

Keizer Little League Letter
Keizer Department of Public Works Letter
Keizer Department of Public Works Memorandum

Keizer Little League
P.O. BOX 7752 / KEIZER, OREGON 97303

June 11, 1993

Keizer City Hall
930 Chemawa Road NE
Keizer, OR 97307
Attn: Mayor and City Council

Dear Sir/Madam:

We of Keizer Little League are hereby requesting a public hearing of the City Council to install Musco directional lighting fixtures at Keizer Little League Park.

Please find attached a letter from Kevin Wickman. All correspondence should be addressed to Clint Holland at P.O. Box 2339, Salem, OR 97308.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Clint Holland

Clint Holland
Keizer Little League
Board of Directors
399-1352

Tom Bauer
Keizer Little League
President

CH/cr

Enclosure

City of Keizer - Public Works Department

1982

Phone: 390-3700 • 393-1608
930 Chemawa Rd. N.E. • P.O. Box 21030 • Keizer, Oregon 97307-1030

May 26, 1993

Clint Holland
Keizer Little League

Dear Clint,

As you requested I have reviewed the proposal to install field lighting at Keizer Little League Park. The proposed Musco directional lighting fixtures appear to be an excellent choice, not only for their state of the art directional design, but also because they are designed to be maintenance friendly. As I see it there are two parts to your proposal, they are as follows:

Part One

To extend the use of any Keizer Park past dark requires that the Park Rules and Regulations be amended. In the case of Keizer Little League Park, the conditional use permit which allows the organized team events at this park must also be opened for public hearing. The reason for this is that improvements made to a facility, such as lighting, can significantly change the way in which that facility is used. The process to amend the conditional use is relatively simple, and would largely be done by the City. These are the steps.

1. Request a public hearing of the City Council

2. Notification in the newspaper as to date, time and topic of the public hearing.

3. Mail written notification to adjoining property owners.

4. Hold public hearing, Regular City Council meeting, and allow for testimony both for and against proposed change.

Keizer Little League Park is a City of Keizer Park, therefore city staff would automatically do steps 2 and 3. Keizer Little League needs to send or present a written request to the City Council for lighting. Staff would then, if so directed by Council, proceed with any of the legal requirements. Keizer Little League Association or other interested parties would be called on at the public hearing to testify on behalf of the proposal. Staff would also comment.

Part Two

The conditional use should specify the hours of use, I propose the following:

1. Keizer Little League Park may extend park hours by lighting from March 1 through August 31.

2. March 1 through May 31, the park will close at 10:00 PM and the lights will be off at that time.

3. June 1 through August 31, the park will close at 11:00 PM and the lights will be off at that time.

4. Sundays the park closes at sunset, no lighting may be used.

The City of Keizer must be furnished with a set of plans showing the proposed lighting for review and approval prior to construction. Upon completion of the project, the City of Keizer must be furnished with a complete set of "to scale as builts" that include the power feed location.

The Keizer Little League Association must provide or arrange for all of the cost of this project. These improvements will be permanent to the park property and will therefore become City Park property.

If you have any questions, please call, I will be glad to help answer or direct any questions that you might have.

Sincerely,

Kevin Wickman
Parks Director

cc Tom Bauer, KLL President
Wally Mull, Public Works Director
Skip Wendowlowski, City Planner
Dotty Tryk, City Manager

1982

City of Keizer — Public Works Department

Phone: 390-3700 • 393-1608 • Fax # 390-8295
930 Chemawa Rd. N.E. • P.O. Box 21030 • Keizer, Oregon 97307-1030

MEMORANDUM

TO: Mayor Dennis Koho
Members of the Keizer City Council

FROM: Parks and Recreation Advisory Board
Shannon Blake-Thiess, Chair

RE: Lighting at Keizer Little League Field

DATE: June 11, 1993

The Keizer Parks and Recreation Advisory Board, in their June 8, 1993 meeting, approved unanimously the following business:

> A motion approving the proposed lighting addition at the Keizer Little League Field as outlined in the Parks Director's letter to Clint Holland dated May 26, 1993, and recommendation to the City Council for consideration at their next meeting.

Thank you for your consideration of this worthy proposal.

CONDITIONAL USE POLICY

Definition

A conditional use is an activity generally similar to other uses permitted in a zone but because of the manner in which land and buildings could be developed to accommodate such use a review of the specific proposed use, and the imposition of special conditions, are often needed to ensure compatibility with land uses in the vicinity.

Policy

Uses listed as Conditional Uses in a zone classification may be approved if the procedures in Chapter 5 are followed and if findings can be made that the criteria in Section 8.30 and the zone, have been satisfied. Conditional uses shall be established and maintained in accordance with the applicable development standards in the zone and in Chapters 12 to 20, and any conditions imposed as part of the approval.

Criteria

The following criteria shall be used to review and decide conditional use permit applications:

(a) The use is listed as a conditional use in the zone.

(b) The parcel is suitable for the proposed use considering such factors as size, shape, location, topography, soils, slope stability, drainage and natural features.

(c) The proposed use, as conditioned, will not materially alter the character of the surrounding area in a manner which substantially limits, impairs, or precludes the use of surrounding properties for the primary uses listed in the applicable zone.

(d) The proposed use will not have a detrimental effect on existing solar or wind energy systems.

(e) Adequate public and utility facilities and services to serve the use exist or will be made available prior to establishment of the use.

1982

City of Keizer

930 Chemawa Rd. N.E. • P.O. Box 21000
Keizer, Oregon 97307-1000 • (503) 390-3700 • Fax # 393-9437

CITY COUNCIL MEETING: June 21, 1993

AGENDA ITEM NUMBER: 8e

TO: MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL

THROUGH: DOTTY TRYK Dotty
CITY MANAGER

FROM: JOHN N. MORGAN, AICP
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR

SUBJECT: CHEMAWA ACTIVITY CENTER PLAN

The Keizer Compressive Plan identifies two "Activity Centers." These are the McNary Activity Center and the Chemawa Activity Center. The Plan identifies these areas as important and needing further detailed study and planning before a specific plan for each can be incorporated into the Comprehensive Plan. The McNary Activity Center Plan was adopted on February 18, 1992.

The Planning Commission has been working on the Chemawa Activity Center Plan for several months. A sub-committee of the Commission spent a great deal of time researching and brainstorming the issues and opportunities. The sub-committee's work was incorporated by John Morgan, Community Development Director, and John Spencer of Spencer and Kupper into a draft plan.

The draft plan has been considered by the full Commission on two occasions. A public hearing will be held before the Commission on July 14, 1993.

The City Council will be holding a hearing and considering the Plan on July 19, 1993. The purpose of tonight's report is to brief the Council on the draft in preparation for the hearing.

A copy of the draft plan is attached to this report. Staff will be orally summarizing the Plan at the Council meeting and will be ready to answer questions.

1. INTRODUCTION

The Chemawa Activity Center, located at the intersection of Chemawa Road and I-5, represents the gateway to the Community and a significant development opportunity for the region. The Keizer Comprehensive Plan recognized this opportunity, and calls for a mix of light industry, hotel/motel, conference center, retail and supporting uses. See Figure 1.

A major shopping center developer evaluated several potential sites in the Salem/Keizer area in 1987, including the Chemawa area. An Activity Center plan was drafted and included in the City of Keizer's proposed local periodic review order. The plan was withdrawn when the developer decided not to invest in the region, and the local periodic review order needed additional work. Later in 1990, another developer conducted preliminary efforts to option much of the area and study the potential for a shopping center. Property owners, City officials and the community have had high expectations, but have been disappointed as exciting prospects have not materialized.

The Keizer Planning Commission focused on the Chemawa area in early 1993, and produced an Outline of Issues and Ideas which is included in the Appendix. This working document illustrates the opportunities for the area, the land use and infrastructure issues which need to be addressed, and the requirement for strong public/private leadership to implement the Activity Center Plan.

2. PURPOSE of the ACTIVITY CENTER PLAN

This Activity Center Plan establishes City policy to guide the intense development allowed by the 1987 Keizer Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Ordinance for the Chemawa Activity Center. The purpose of the Activity Center Plan is to establish policies for a mix of land uses, to identify basic public facilities needed to handle anticipated growth, and to develop a financial strategy to pay for necessary improvements.

This document represents a Phase 1 plan for the Chemawa Activity Center. In considering the possible land uses for the area, the Planning Commission noted that light industrial uses may one of several acceptable primary uses. A shift from light industrial will require major changes to the Keizer Comprehensive Plan and delay adoption of the Chemawa Activity Center Plan. The Phase 1 plan:

1. Implements the Comprehensive Plan,
2. Defines a broad vision for the Chemawa Activity Center which is consistent with the current Comprehensive Plan land use designations and provides for flexibility,
3. Identifies the basic public facilities which will support a range of potential uses,
4. Considers short-term regulations to assure that future opportunities are preserved, and
5. Identifies the public and private roles to achieve this vision.
6. Sets the stage for more detailed economic analysis, planning, and implementation.

Additional phases of this plan may be undertaken as new opportunities are identified.

3. THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FRAMEWORK

3.1 The Activity Center Plan Area

The Activity Center Plan covers the area designated as the Chemawa Activity Center in the Keizer Comprehensive Plan. The area is an "urban transition" district: existing single-family dwellings on large lots are mixed with small farms, nurseries and other agricultural uses. Approximately 10 percent of the land area is developed. (See Figure 1)

The Keizer Comprehensive Plan establishes general land use patterns and policies for this area. North of Lockhaven Drive, Area A is designated Commercial and Campus Light Industrial. Area B is also designated for light industrial uses. South of Lockhaven Drive, Area C is designated for light industrial uses. Policies in the Keizer Comprehensive Plan determine that an employment area service center should be located within the Chemawa Activity Center, and require that Activity Center plans are prepared and approved before specific development applications in the activity center are approved.

The land use designations shown on Figure 2 in the Keizer Comprehensive Plan, and on the zoning map before an Activity Center plan is adopted, are generalized and will be refined during the preparation of Activity Center plans. Transfer of development rights within activity centers are allowed and planned developments are encouraged. Activity Center plans will be prepared for entire activity centers, not individual parcels or for individual projects.

3.2 Comprehensive Plan

The Keizer Comprehensive Plan identifies several policies for the Chemawa Activity Center:

1. Primary uses are employment area service center, light industry, hotel/motel and supporting facilities, convention facilities, and retail shopping facilities.

2. Improve access to the district and Lockhaven Drive. Coordinate transportation improvements with the industrial district to the north.

An Employment Area Service Center is to be located near the Chemawa Interchange in the Chemawa Activity Center. Policies for Employment Area Service Centers are stated in the Plan:

1. Allowed uses are retail, service, and office uses related to nearby industrial districts, and area commercial uses serving the traveling public such as restaurants, hotels, conference centers and shopping facilities.

2. A employment area service center should:

    a. Be from 20 to 50 acres in size.

    b. Have direct access from I-5 and an arterial street.

    c. Provide facilities and services to adjacent industrial areas and to the traveling public.

    d. Not encourage traffic through residential neighborhoods.

    e. Be a unified district with coordinated circulation, parking and landscaping, not a collection of small unrelated commercial developments.

3. An employment area service center will be located near the Chemawa Interchange in the Chemawa Activity Center.

This Activity Center Plan is intended to implement these policies.

4. CHEMAWA ACTIVITY CENTER PLAN

4.1 Role of This Plan

The Chemawa Activity Center Plan will be adopted as an element of the Keizer Comprehensive Plan. All development activity within the area will be reviewed and approved in accordance with the provisions of this Plan. The Comprehensive Plan will be revised concurrent with the adoption of this Plan to acknowledge and incorporate it.

The Plan has __ policies which are found in subsections below. These are the functional components of this Plan, and all development proposals will be evaluated based on these policies. All material in this Plan other than the policies is description and analytical and is subservient to the policies. Recommended actions and strategies found in the Plan provide direction for additional work tasks necessary to implement this Plan.

4.2 Summary

The Chemawa Activity Center Plan calls for the future development of a dynamic, attractive mixed use area incorporating a mix of retail, office, service commercial, public and semi-public, and light industrial uses near the I-5 Chemawa interchange. South of Lockhaven Drive, Ridge Drive will require realignment to better serve adjacent land uses and solve traffic conflicts at Lockhaven. The intersection of Chemawa Road and Lockhaven Drive will be closed.

North of Lockhaven Drive, basic public facilities such as sanitary sewer, water, drainage, and streets must be provided to serve a mix of commercial and light industrial uses. These public facilities are located and designed in a way that allows some flexibility in the amount and location of specific commercial developments, and permits the City to respond to individual development opportunities as they occur. Major improvements to the Radiant Drive/Lockhaven Drive intersection will be required, as will future improvements to the I-5 Chemawa on and off ramps.

In order for the Activity Center Plan to be realized, the City of Keizer must take an aggressive posture regarding public facility planning and financing. The City should pursue designating the Chemawa area as an Urban Renewal District, and should utilize tax increment funds, as well as development fees and assessment fees to finance needed public improvements. Grants and loans from the Oregon Economic Development Department should also be pursued.

It is also imperative the City of Keizer take an aggressive economic development posture, taking leadership and partnership with the private sector in marketing and developing the properties within the Activity Center.

4.3 The Plan Area

The Comprehensive Plan identifies the area within the Chemawa Activity Center. These lands, when the Plan was adopted in 1987, were those lands within the City where more detailed planning and development was required. Since the Comprehensive Plan was adopted, the area south of Chemawa Road east of the railroad was annexed. This area is approximately 20 acres, and was originally acquired by ODOT for construction of the I-5/Chemawa interchange. Because this area is a significant vacant parcel located adjacent to the I-5 interchange, it is appropriate to include it within the Chemawa Activity Center.

Action:

1. *The Chemawa Activity Center designation shown in the Keizer Comprehensive Plan shall be amended to include the ODOT property southwest of the I-5 interchange.*

4.4 Land Use and Circulation Concept

Three land use scenarios for the Chemawa area were evaluated in terms of transportation and public improvement impacts and Comprehensive Plan policies. The Appendix includes a description of the scenarios considered. There is not a significant difference among the scenarios for the need for sanitary and storm sewers, water supply and distribution and local streets. Any of the scenarios could be viable at the Chemawa location, but market forces and developer preference will largely determine the future of the Activity Center Plan area. A flexible plan is needed which outlines the public intent for the area while allowing developers and property owners a wide range of development options.

Based on the consideration of transportation and public improvement impacts and Comprehensive Plan policies, Scenario B is recommended as the general land use mix for the Chemawa Activity Center. A land use and circulation plan concept is shown which provides needed flexibility to allow a wide range of development options, and to accommodate the land use mix described at the end of this section. (See Figure 2)

Area A: Radiant Drive

This area includes approximately 100 acres and extends from Tepper Lane south to Chemawa Road. In Area A, Radiant Drive is realigned to the west providing direct access to service commercial, retail and hotel/conference center uses located at the southern end of the area. This new street would extend to Tepper Lane along the existing railroad tracks serving the BPA facility. Depending on developer and user preference, the hotel and service commercial areas could be transposed. Office uses are proposed north of the commercial area. A loop road is proposed to extend from Radiant Drive to the eastern part of the area, and connecting to Tepper Lane at the intersection of the existing Radiant Drive. A new east-west road is proposed which will connect the realigned Radiant Drive to the new loop road. This new street will provide access to light industrial uses located in the northern portion of Area A, and to the general industrial area north of Tepper Lane. The location of the proposed street system permits some flexibility for the specific location of different land uses.

Policies:

1. *The land use and circulation concept described above and shown on the concept diagram shall guide all future development activity in the area.*

2. *The future use of this area consistent with the land use and circulation concept shall be retained and protected by continuing the Urban Transition (UT) zoning designation. The UT zone shall remain until public facilities including streets, sanitary sewer, water and drainage improvements described in this Plan are provided.*

Area B: North of Lockhaven

This area includes approximately 13 acres, and is located north of Lockhaven Drive. The predominant land use is planned for light industrial, but medium and high density housing may also be considered at a later date.

Policies:

1. *The future land use shall be campus light industrial.*

2. *The future use of this area shall be retained and protected by continuing the Urban Transition (UT) zoning designation. The UT zone shall remain until public facilities including streets, sanitary sewer, water and drainage improvements described in this Plan are provided.*

3. *The number of vehicle access points on Lockhaven Drive shall be minimized. Combining access points for adjacent parcels shall be required .*

4. *A minimum spacing standard for vehicle access points shall be 400 feet apart along an arterial street and 200 feet along a collector street.*

Area C: West of Railroad

Area C includes approximately 37 acres south of Lockhaven Drive and west of the Railroad. The predominant land use is planned for light industrial, but medium and high density housing, recreation or commercial uses may also be considered at a later date.

The circulation system in Area C consists of the realignment of the intersection of Chemawa Road to the west to form an intersection on Lockhaven Drive opposite McLeod Lane. This proposed circulation system in Area C presents the opportunity for a simple rail crossing and local street access to Area D. Because of the need for a major signalized intersection at Radiant Drive, and the heavy turning volumes anticipated between that intersection and the freeway ramps, access from Area D directly to Lockhaven is not recommended.

Policies:

1. *The future land use shall be campus light industrial.*

2. *The future use of this area shall be retained and protected by continuing the Urban Transition (UT) zoning designation. The UT zone shall remain until public facilities including streets, sanitary sewer, water and drainage improvements described in this Plan are provided.*

3. *The number of vehicle access points on Lockhaven Drive shall be minimized. Combining access points for adjacent parcels shall be required .*

4. *A minimum spacing standard for vehicle access points shall be 400 feet apart along an arterial street and 200 feet along a collector street.*

Area D: ODOT Property

This area includes approximately 20 acres originally acquired by ODOT for construction of the I-5/Chemawa interchange. The area is identified for future transportation use including park and ride facility, and transit center. Limited supporting commercial uses may also be provided.

Policies:

1. *The future land use shall be campus light industrial.*

2. *The future use of this area shall be retained and protected by continuing the Urban Transition (UT) zoning designation. The UT zone shall remain until public facilities including streets, sanitary sewer, water and drainage improvements described in this Plan are provided.*

4.5 Public Improvements

The Chemawa Activity Center will require a full range of public improvements in order to develop to the densities called for in this Plan. A discussion of public improvement issues and requirements is included in the Appendix. A public facilities plan was prepared for the Chemawa Activity Center in 1988, and subsequently updated and included in the City's Public Facility Plan. A summery of all projects and their estimated cost is also found in the Appendix.

The public facility plan for the Chemawa Activity Center is described below.

Transportation Facilities

The Chemawa Interchange area is quickly developing into a major transportation hub. At this intersection automobiles are served by Interstate 5, by Salem Parkway as a major access to downtown Salem and the Capitol Mall, and by Lockhaven, Chemawa, and Hazelgreen as east/west arterials. Transit and car and vanpools are served by the future park and ride on the ODOT property and by the immediate access to major travel routes. Finally, passenger rail service will interface with the area via the near-term development of high-speed rail on the Southern Pacific tracks immediately east of the interchange, and via the future rail link between the interchange and downtown Salem and the Capitol Mall along the Burlington Northern tracks.

This "hub" of travel activity provides a strong catalyst for the top-quality economic development of the interchange area. It also is a function that should be strengthened and supported through this Plan. Major areas of planned improvements are discussed below.

Street Improvements

The Activity Center Plan has been developed to provide for a traffic circulation pattern which will provide for a minimum of conflicts on the major arterial. Specific planned changes include:

1. The Radiant Drive intersection with Chemawa Road will require signalization.

2. Chemawa Road's intersection with Lockhaven will be closed, with traffic rerouted north on McLeod to access Lockhaven at this newly signalized and improved intersection.

3. Radiant Drive will be disconnected from Lockhaven and realigned to connect with the intersection of McLeod and Chemawa. This will provide a continuous north/south collector route through the entire area while solving a traffic problem at Lockhaven.

4. Chemawa Road will require widening between the I-5 off-ramps and Radiant Drive. The widening will allow turn lanes from Chemawa Road to Radiant Drive to be constructed.

5. The off ramp from I-5 North bound to Chemawa Road westbound may require widening to handle two left turn lanes. A new signal head and restriping would also be required.

6. Restriping at the southbound approach to I-5 and the Salem Parkway from Chemawa Road will also be required.

As part of the I-5 interchange reconfiguration discussed above, the completion of an undercrossing under Lockhaven linking Area A and Area D is planned. This access is important in order to fully integrate park-and-ride and other transit transfer functions planned for Area D with the rest of the Activity Center. It also is important to the area south of Lockhaven with the realignment of Radiant to the west.

Public Transit

As the Chemawa Activity Center develops the present public transit operation will be adjusted in two major ways. As the area becomes more of a destination for shopping, employment, and transfer to other modes of travel, the Transit District will need to adjust routing and scheduling to best meet the needs of those accessing the area. Second, the interchange will serve as a central transfer facility to allow access to express service to downtown Salem and the Capitol Mall, as well as intercity service to Portland.

The ODOT property, Area D, has been identified for a park and ride facility. This facility will be a multi-modal transfer center serving local and regional bus service, and carpool and vanpool service.

The Burlington Northern Railroad line runs between Eugene and Portland and passes through the center of the Chemawa Activity Center. Both Keizer and Salem have set public policy in their respective Comprehensive Plans to acquire this right-of-way and to reuse it as a transportation corridor. It is possible to develop rail service, such as a trolley, between the Chemawa Activity Center and Downtown Salem. Since the tracks currently exist, rail service cost between Salem downtown and the Chemawa Activity Center would be minimal. The opportunity to connect these two shopping areas by rail could open up innovative financing alternatives as well as provide a regional attraction. This corridor may also be utilized for pedestrian and bicycle links.

The High-Speed Rail Project between Eugene and Vancouver, British Columbia is proposed for the Southern Pacific Railroad line which runs east of I-5. A potential station is identified at Chemawa Road. A link between the station and the Activity Center would enhance both areas.

Pedestrian/Bicycle Circulation

All public roadways within the Activity Center will be built with sidewalks as per the present City of Keizer standards. Bicycle paths would be developed in accordance with the present bicycle path plan for the Salem/Keizer area. Modification to the plan could be made where the City felt that additional bicycle provisions should be provided to provide access to commercial areas.

Sewer and Water Facilities

No major sewer projects are proposed to serve areas B and C. Service to Area A will require the construction of the Labish trunk from the intersection of North River Road and Wheatland Road to a point approximately in the center of Area A. The line will have the capacity to serve other presently unserved areas of Keizer.

Proposed is the construction of a 10 inch water main from the intersection of Lockhaven Drive and McLeod Lane to a new well in Area A. This extension will provide the basis for domestic water service and fire protection. Future extensions of this system to the North will provide service to the light industrial area north of the activity center.

Storm Drainage Facilities

Development of the activity center will require construction of major storm drainage systems. The system which would serve Area C and a portion of Area B was shown on the Keizer Master Storm Drain Plan. The system which serves the balance of Area B and Area A is proposed to be constructed to Labish Ditch. Local detention basins are not shown but would be required as development occurs as per the City's present policy of requiring stormwater detention.

Public Improvement Policies:

1. *The public improvement plan outlined above and included in the City's Public Facilities Plan, shall be incorporated as part of this Plan.*

2. *A comprehensive transportation plan shall be prepared by the City. This transportation plan shall consider traffic circulation within the Activity Center and to I-5, and alternative modes. The transportation plan will refine project activities previously described in this Plan.*

3. *The comprehensive transportation plan described above shall include a financing plan. The financing plan shall identify potential funding sources, and a cost-sharing strategy for all new development.*

4.6 Phasing and Interim Improvements

The transportation and public facility requirements noted above will be required to support full development of the Chemawa Activity Center. However, interim improvements may be possible to support early phases of development. These interim improvements should be identified as specific development applications are considered by the City. In no case, however, should interim improvements preclude the later development of transportation and public facility projects as outlined above, and all new development should be required to participate in funding these longer-term projects.

Policy:

1. *Interim improvements public improvements shall not preclude the later development of transportation and public facility project adopted as part of this Plan.*

ACTIVITY CENTER PLAN LAND USE MIX

Land Uses	**Net Acres**
Area A	
Public, Semi-Public	
Major Streets	16.7 Acres
Detention Basin	3.0 Acres
PGE Site	2.5 Acres
RR Roadway	.8 Acre
Power Line ROW	2.0 Acres
Subtotal Public	**25.0 Acres**
Campus Light Industrial	**25.5 Acres**
Commercial	
Hotel/Conference Ctr.	3.6 Acres
Office	4.8 Acres
Service Commercial	6.6 Acres
Retail Commercial	34.5 Acres
Subtotal Commercial	**49.5 Acres**
Total Area A	**100.0 Acres**
Area B	
Public Streets	0.5 Acres
Campus Light Industrial	12.5 Acres
Total Area B	**13.0 Acres**
Area C	
Public Streets	6.2 Acres
Campus Light Industrial	30.8 Acres
Total Area C	**37.0 Acres**
Area D	
Campus Light Industrial	20.0 Acres
Total Area D	**20.0 Acres**
Total All Areas	**170.0 Acres**

ACTIVITY CENTER PLAN LAND USE MIX

Land Uses	**Net Acres**
Area A	
Public, Semi-Public	
Major Streets	16.7 Acres
Detention Basin	3.0 Acres
PGE Site	2.5 Acres
RR Roadway	.8 Acre
Power Line ROW	2.0 Acres
Subtotal Public	**25.0 Acres**
Campus Light Industrial	**25.5 Acres**
Commercial	
Hotel/Conference Ctr.	3.6 Acres
Office	4.8 Acres
Service Commercial	6.6 Acres
Retail Commercial	34.5 Acres
Subtotal Commercial	**49.5 Acres**
Total Area A	**100.0 Acres**
Area B	
Public Streets	0.5 Acres
Campus Light Industrial	12.5 Acres
Total Area B	**13.0 Acres**
Area C	
Public Streets	6.2 Acres
Campus Light Industrial	30.8 Acres
Total Area C	**37.0 Acres**
Area D	
Campus Light Industrial	20.0 Acres
Total Area D	**20.0 Acres**
Total All Areas	**170.0 Acres**

5. FINANCIAL AND IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY

Implementation of the Activity Center Plan cannot be accomplished without targeting substantial sources of revenue for recommended projects. Commitment of City resources and energies will also be required. If the City truly wants to encourage economic development, it must enthusiastically support and promote the effort, it must commit adequate staff resources, it must be willing to commit public funds, it must be willing to exercise its legal rights for the benefit of the community, it must be flexible and able to respond quickly to changing conditions, and perhaps most importantly, it must be willing to take chances in pursuit of a vision. The Activity Center Plan is the blueprint for that vision.

5.1 Financial Strategy

Based on the examination of the local revenue options described in the Appendix and considering other federal, state and regional sources, it was found that:

> Federal revenue sources could substantially contribute to the implementation of needed projects. However, these revenue sources could not meet total revenue needs and under any circumstance, local revenue would need to match the federal funds.
>
> The development community can contribute through land dedications to the betterment of the area. LID's and service fees are proven methods of providing sewer and water service when done in conjunction with development.
>
> The public improvement problems in the Activity Center Plan area require a comprehensive approach and tax increment financing provides such a comprehensive approach. This financing method can accomplish needed improvements quickly, and can have long-term, positive impacts on the total assessed value of the City. However, with Measure 5 limitations on tax increment funding, as interpreted by the Oregon Supreme Court, there may be serious limitation on the capability to use these fund. Equivalent tax rates for urban renewal activities must be counted in the $10.00 per thousand limitation. Therefore, there is concern about counting on tax increment financing as the financial foundation of this project.
>
> State of Oregon Economic Development Funds may be appropriate for development of the infrastructure to serve the Activity Center. These funds are primarily used when there is a clear showing of positive economic impacts, especially in the creation of jobs. The thrust of this Plan is to create such an impact, and therefore Economic Development funds become an important part of the financing strategy.
>
> In conclusion, no single source of funds can be targeted as the way to pay for needed infrastructure improvements.

Financial strategy:

1. *Use federal, state, and regional revenue sources, particularly in the area of transportation, to the fullest extent possible.*
2. *Continue the current use of service fees and LID's to provide various utilities where practical.*
3. *Encourage developers and local property owners to be responsible for outright dedication of needed public right of way.*

4. *New development continues to be responsible for on-site public improvements and connections to the main systems specified in the Activity Center Plan.*

5. *Tax increment financing shall be considered as a major method of raising the local share of revenue needed to complete projects listed in the Activity Center Plan, with the City proceeding immediately after adoption of the Activity Center Plan with the steps necessary for district formation.*

6. *Economic Development Funds from the State of Oregon should be pursued in earnest as a primary source of infrastructure funding. As part of the overall financing plan, the City shall begin pursuit of these funds.*

7. *During the process of establishing a tax increment financing district, contract for an independent financial analysis which will include assessed value projections, and a revenue forecast. Should a TIF district not be feasible, the City will propose an alternate financial program, recognizing that such a program could have the affect of retarding and/or restructuring recommended projects.*

8. *After adoption of the Activity Center Plan, the City will develop detailed engineering, design and financing priorities and adopt a financial program according to the requirements of Oregon Law. Improvement projects that have broad public benefit and require comprehensive construction approaches should be included in the public component this major capital improvement project.*

9. *Establish or expand City service responsibility as necessary to provide for continuous maintenance and operation of the storm drainage and other systems.*

5.2 Marketing Strategy

In addition to adopting the Activity Center and preparing the necessary planning, engineering and financial work necessary to establish a tax increment financing district, the City should conduct the following marketing activities.

Marketing Strategy:

1. Conduct on economic evaluation of the mix of development types which represent the highest and best use for the Activity Center area, and which have the best prospect of obtaining market support in short, and longer-range horizons.

2. Using the information from the economic evaluation, work with local economic development and other interested citizen groups to identify high priority companies and developments suitable for the interchange location.

3. Based on this evaluation of development types, and expressed preferences among various development types, identify major developers and end users active in, or likely to be interested in development in the region.

4. Prepare an information package outlining the market opportunities in the Chemawa area location, the requirements imposed on developments in the area, and the levels of assistance which might be made available through the City, or the urban renewal agency.

5. Send information packages to representatives of targeted developers or users, promoting economic development opportunities in the Activity Center area.

6. Send information packages to commercial real estate brokers in the Keizer-Salem and Portland areas, to local Chambers of Commerce, and to representatives of the Oregon Economic Development Department.

7. In addition to the traditional marketing steps outlined in items 1-5, the City, or the Renewal Agency, in co-operation with property owners in the Activity Center area could prepare a form of solicitation for development proposals in the Activity Center area. This soliciation would identify market opportunities, cite the availability, price and terms for land, state any requirements imposed on the development, and note any assistance available through the City, or the Redevelopment Agency. Interested developers could be invited to submit proposals for evaluation by the City, the Renewal Agency, or an appointed citizens panel.

Steps in implementing the Marketing Strategy

1. Retain an economist to do a low-level "highest and best use" analysis of the Activity Center area.

2. When the highest and best use analysis is completed, prepare a development and marketing strategy paper, defining the types of used desire by the City, and their preferred location within the Activity Center area.

3. Define the level of assistance, if any, the City, or urban renewal agency is willing to extend to attract various types of developments to the Activity Center.

4. Prepare market and demographic information about the Keizer market, and relevant information about the Activity Center site.

5. Prepare a marketing brochure for the Activity Center incorporating at least the demographic and site specific information from item 4. This brochure might include desired uses, and level of assistance, or those might be incorporated into a more detailied report to be used for follow up on initial expressions of interest.

6. With the assistance of the economic consultant, area brokers, and other knowledgeable sources, prepare a target list of parties to receive the marketing package.

7. Identify a central source at the City for distributing the marketing information, and receiving inquiries about the Acitvity Center.

8. Send the brochure to the targeted list of brokers, developers, and end users.

9. Establish a procedure for handling inquiries, and for request for City and/or urban renewal financial assistance to developers.

5.3 Activity Center Plan Approval

The Chemawa Activity Center Plan is to be implemented through the zoning and subdivision process.

Actions:

1. *Adopt the land use designations as shown on Figure 3 as the Comprehensive Plan land use designations for the Activity Center. All commercial uses shown on Figure 3 (Hotel/Conference Center, Office, Service and Retail) shall have a commercial designation in the Comprehensive Plan.*

2. *Once this Activity Center Plan is approved, individual development applications will be subject to the provisions of Chapter 46-Activity Center Overlay of the City of Keizer Zoning Ordinance. Specific zoning designations will be proposed for areas within the Activity Center Overlay subject to section 46.03(a)(4), and approved by the City.*

3. *Adopt the following development standards in addition to the standards contained in the City of Keizer Zoning Ordinance:*

    a. *Outdoor storage of materials and equipment is prohibited in all commercial areas except in conjunction with residential uses where the storage shall be screened from view from the street and adjacent properties by a sight obscuring fence, wall or hedge.*

    b. *The following uses shall not be permitted in retail and office areas: gasoline service stations, vehicle sales and secondary repair, recreational vehicle parks, and all conditional uses listed in Section 28.02 of the Zoning Ordinance, except 12 and 13.*

ISSUES and PROBLEMS

Traffic and Circulation

Main arterial access for the Chemawa Activity Center will be via I-5 and Chemawa Road. Present access to these arterials is adequate to handle the existing volumes of traffic. As the Activity Center develops, traffic volumes will increase to the extent that major improvements to the transportation system will be required. The design plan anticipates growth in traffic in the area and is developed in such a way as to provide for that growth.

The Activity Center is divided by the Oregon Electric Railroad tracks. The present rail traffic in this area is quite low, which minimizes interruptions to through traffic. New crossings of the railroad should be kept at a minimum. The present access to the activity center on the east side of the railroad (Area A) is provided by Radiant Drive. This access is approximately 800 feet west of the signalized off ramp from I-5. It is anticipated that additional accesses to Chemawa Road between Radiant Drive and I-5 will be disfavored by ODOT. The Radiant Drive access will become the main entrance to the activity center on the north. The large volumes of traffic using this access will create the need for a signalized intersection. The design plan provides for a boulevard type street for the Radiant Drive access. It is proposed that a divider island be used along the Radiant Drive arterial to the first main side street. The right of way needs for the southerly 1800 feet will be approximately 120 feet. The right of way proposed will accommodate two north bound lanes, one north bound bike path, two south bound left turn lanes and one south bound right turn lane and one south bound bike path.

Main power distribution lines along the east side of the railroad present additional challenges for determining the final placement and width of the Radiant Drive arterial.

Additional access to area A is available from Tepper Lane. This roadway presently serves the residential areas west of Area A and the Bonneville Power and P.G.E. substations. It is not anticipated that the traffic volumes will be large from the residential areas west of the railroad to Area A via Tepper Lane. The Keizer Comprehensive Plan indicates a future roadway from Area A to North River Road which would provide for additional access. The design plan provides for improving Tepper Lane to a collector standard along the north line of Area A.

The I-5 - Salem Parkway access to Area A will require a high volume of left turn movements form the northbound off ramp of I-5 to Chemawa Rd. and from the southbound Radiant Drive Boulevard to I-5 on Chemawa Road.

Public Facilities/Utilities

The Chemawa Activity Center will require full municipal services to develop fully. The City of Keizer provides water service, sewer service, street and storm drainage maintenance, police service and other city services. The Keizer Fire District provides fire protection to this area of the City of Keizer. Portland General Electric Company provides power service to this area of Keizer. Northwest Natural Gas Company provides gas service to all of Keizer. Telephone service is available to the area as is cable TV.

The City of Keizer is currently undertaking a revision of it's master water plan. The plan currently being used as a guide by the city was developed by the Keizer Water District prior to the incorporation of the city when a large portion of the activity center was not under the District's jurisdiction. The design plan assumes that a new water main will be constructed along Lockhaven

Drive to serve the activity center. In addition, it is anticipated that a new source of water supply in Area A will be developed (see Figure 4). Areas B and C are presently served by the City's water system. Some minor upgrading of the system in this area is proposed.

The City of Keizer has adopted a master sewer plan update to guide the city in decisions regarding sanitary sewer service. The master sewer plan proposes a major sewer trunk to be constructed along Labish Ditch to provide sewer service to Area A as well as portions of the city in the Clearlake area (see Figure 4). Areas B and C presently have sewer service available with only minor modifications required.

A master storm drainage plan for portions of the city of Keizer was developed for the Keizer Sewer and Drainage District in 1980. The plan identified several major drainage projects that would be necessary to serve the activity center. Area A was not included in the drainage study. The design plan provides for a storm drainage system that uses elements of the previous study as well as a drainage system to Labish Ditch which would serve as an outlet for Area A. It is assumed that the City will continue it's present policy of requiring on-site detention to reduce the impact of large storm peaks.

Land Use and Ownership

The Activity Center Plan area contains approximately 150 acres, with the majority of the district located north of Lockhaven Drive and east of the Oregon Electric Railroad Line. Currently, approximately 50 housing units are located within the district, distributed about evenly along Radiant Drive and Chemawa Road. Approximately 83 properties are owned by about 55 different parties. The great majority of land area, about 80-90 percent, is in some form of agricultural use or vacant. The size, shape and location of existing properties are not appropriate for a coordinated mixed-use development. Land acquisition will be necessary to consolidate small properties into larger development sites. Additionally, the existing local streets in the area, Radiant Drive and Chemawa Road, run diagonally through both north and south areas, resulting in land areas poorly shaped for commercial and industrial development. Relocation and improvement of these streets will be necessary to support future development, and to create workable development sites.

Future Demand for Land

The opening of Chemawa Interchange makes vacant land adjacent to the interchange attractive for commercial and industrial development. Forecasts prepared for the Comprehensive Plan estimate that 311 to 358 acres of commercial and industrial land will be needed during the next twenty years. Approximately 42 percent of the commercial and industrial development expected in the city is located in the Activity Center Plan area.

In the, a major commercial center developer has conducted market and feasibility studies for a development at a freeway interchange just south of Keizer. These studies have indicated that a major commercial development can be supported by the region, and that a freeway interchange is the best location for such a development. The Chemawa Activity Center has also been evaluated, and the developer has shown interest in both intersection locations. Other developers and economic development experts have concluded that the Chemawa Activity Center is an attractive location for commercial and industrial development. The primary factors influencing development at this location will be the growth and health of the regional economy, availability of adequate land at a reasonable price, planned or constructed transportation and public facilities necessary to support development, and positive public policy.

No specific development proposal or single developer has committed to the Activity Center Plan area. Therefore, a range of development options including several land use scenarios were prepared for the Activity Center Plan including a range of land use mixes.

Keizer considers the current Activity Center Plan proposal to be conceptual in nature. Further development of detail would be completed as part of the zoning process once a specific development proposal had committed itself to the area. A flexible plan is needed to support and attract future development proposals.

LAND USE SCENARIOS

Three land use scenarios were prepared for the Activity Center Plan area which represent a range of land use mix. Light industrial development was assumed for each scenario in Area C south of Lockhaven Drive and Area B west of the railroad line. A mix of light industrial and commercial uses were assumed for Area A north of Lockhaven Drive. The following scenarios describe land use options for the Activity Center Plan area.

Scenario A

This scenario is based on designating approximately 35 percent of Area A for light industrial uses, with the remaining area designated for a variety of commercial uses. A hotel/conference center and related commercial uses such as restaurants, would need about 8 acres, office uses about 8 acres, and low density retail shopping uses about 24 acres. The retail center may be enclosed, or may be a series of smaller centers or single-user buildings.

Scenario B

Approximately 25 percent of Area A is designated for light industrial uses, with a greater area used for commercial purposes. A hotel/conference center and related commercial uses would need about 7 acres, office uses about 7 acres and a high density retail shopping facility about 35 acres. This scenario assumes an enclosed shopping center is developed in Area A, with supporting commercial and office uses located nearby.

Scenario C

Scenario C provides for about 7 acres of light industrial uses in Area A, with the majority of the area devoted to commercial uses. The same scale of hotel, office and support commercial uses are assumed here as with the other scenarios. The retail commercial uses with this scenario could take a variety of different forms. A closed or enclosed shopping center is possible, along with single-user structures with their own access and parking. A similar retail center is developing in the East Delta Park area in Portland. Many of the single-user operations are discount stores offering durable goods such as building materials, appliances and furniture. These structures are often used for warehousing merchandise as well as selling goods to the public.

SUMMARY OF LAND USE SCENARIOS

Land Uses	Scenario A	Scenario B	Scenario C
Area A			
Public/Semi-Public	25 Acres	25 Acres	25 Acres
Light Industrial	35 Acres	25 Acres	7 Acres
Hotel/Confer. Ctr.	4 Acres	4 Acres	4 Acres
Office	8 Acres	7 Acres	8 Acres
Service Commercial	4 Acres	4 Acres	4 Acres
Retail Commercial	24 Acres	35 Acres	52 Acres
Total Area A	**100 Acres**	**100 Acres**	**100 Acres**
Area B			
Light Industrial	**13 Acres**	**13 Acres**	**13 Acres**
Area C			
Public/Semi-Public	6 Acres	6 Acres	6 Acres
Light Industrial	31 Acres	31 Acres	31 Acres
Total Area C	**37 Acres**	**37 Acres**	**37 Acres**
Totals	**150 Acres**	**150 Acres**	**150 Acres**

PROJECT IMPROVEMENTS and COSTS

A. Street Construction	
1. Radiant Drive Boulevard	$ 287,200
2. Signalization of Radiant Drive @ Chemawa Road	159,500
3. Balance of street system in Area A	625,400
4. Improvements to Lockhaven	
Between I-5 and Radiant Drive	229,700
Between McLeod Lane and Radiant Drive	204,20
Improvements to signals at on and off ramps	108,500
5. Signal at McLeod Lane	127,600
6. Roadway Improvement within Area C	523,300
Subtotal Street Construction	**$2,265,400**
B. Storm Drainage Construction	
1. Storm drain trunk system Area A	$ 772,200
2. Storm drain trunk system Area B	439,900
Subtotal Storm Drainage	**$1,266,100**
C. Sanitary Sewer Construction	
1. Trunk Line to serve Area A	**$ 1,266,100**
D. Water System Construction	
1. Well and distribution	**$478,600**
TOTAL COST	**$5,401,200**

FINANCING ALTERNATIVES

Local Improvement District

A Local Improvement District (LID) is a method used to finance public improvements and facilities by distributing the costs of the improvements to surrounding property owners. This tool has the advantages of insuring that all the benefiting property owners pay an equitable amount towards an improvement, and it allows property owners to finance their assessment over time at attractive interest rates. The disadvantage is that if property owners do not benefit from the improvement, the costs may be a substantial economic burden.

Tax Increment Financing

Tax Increment Financing is a vehicle made available under the provisions of Oregon's Urban Renewal Statutes. Once a governmental body adopts an urban renewal plan, a statement of the total true cash value of all the real and personal property in a renewal area is made and it is called the "frozen base." The "frozen base" is used to calculate tax increment proceeds that go the to local renewal agency. Property tax revenues from the frozen base still are distributed to local taxing bodies, but during the life of the Urban Renewal Plan, the local renewal agency will receive tax revenues from any increase or "increment" in true cash value in the renewal area. These "increment" funds can be used for public improvements and other purposes specified in the local Urban Renewal Plan prepared for a specific area. An advantage of this method is that needed up-front improvements such as sewers, water and streets can be financed by bonds repaid by tax increment funds.

Systems Development Charge and Donations

Traditionally, developers have constructed, at their expense, streets, water supply and sewage systems, and drainage systems within their developments. Donation of land for public right of way and improvements is also typical. All new development, however, creates additional public costs. Some of these are capital costs such as utilities, schools and the like. Others are operating costs such as police and fire protection and general government. A systems development charge is a method to assess the off-site impacts caused by a development, and require the development to pay for these impacts which are related to and benefiting the development.

Municipal Bonds and Special Tax Levy

Municipal bonds are issued to finance public capital improvements, and represent public borrowing from a financial institution with repayment and interest specified by an agreement. Bonds are typically backed by a municipality's taxing power. A special tax levy is usually needed, requiring a public election to approve the added property tax needed to retire the bonds. This method may not be reliable for public improvements in a largely undeveloped area where the improvements do not directly benefit the majority of voters.

City of Keizer

1982

930 Chemawa Rd. N.E. • P.O. Box 21000
Keizer, Oregon 97307-1000 • (503) 390-3700 • Fax # 393-9437

CITY COUNCIL MEETING: June 21, 1993

AGENDA ITEM NUMBER: 9a

TO: MAYOR KOHO AND CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS

THROUGH: DOTTY TRYK
CITY MANAGER

FROM: JOHN N. MORGAN, AICP
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR

SUBJECT: PERIODIC REVIEW UPDATE

City Council, on June 7, considered a staff report recommending a strategy for approaching the Land Conservation and Development Commission during its hearing on the proposed Keizer Periodic Review Order. The Council gave Staff strong direction on retaining local control relative to land use decisions on industrial property.

Staff presented the Council's position on Thursday, June 10, and prevailed through a 4 to 3 vote of the LCDC.

At this time the final LCDC order has not been received, but it will include a provision allowing Salem and Keizer to change up to 100 acres of large industrial properties to other uses before December 31, 1993. The December 31 date is the deadline for adopting revisions to the Comprehensive Plan ordered by the Commission relative to the urban growth boundary and housing issues.

The compliance order will also direct Keizer and Salem to engage in an update of Project 90, the 12 year old economic strategy for the urban area. Staff will return to Council with an assessment of this project and a work plan after discussions on coordinating this work with the other jurisdictions have been completed.

RECOMMENDATION:

For information only.

1982

City of Keizer

930 Chemawa Rd. N.E. • P.O. Box 21000
Keizer, Oregon 97307-1000 • (503) 390-3700 • Fax # 393-9437

COUNCIL MEETING: June 21, 1993

AGENDA ITEM NUMBER: 9b

TO: MAYOR KOHO AND CITY COUNCIL

THROUGH: DOTTY TRYK
CITY MANAGER

FROM: TRACY L. DAVIS
CITY RECORDER

SUBJECT: THE MEADOWS PHASE 6 STREET LIGHTING DISTRICT

ISSUE:

Review the City Engineer's report filed for The Meadows Phase 6 Street Lighting District and consider a Resolution to adopt this report and to set a public hearing date to receive remonstrances to the project.

BACKGROUND:

On May 17, 1993, the City Council adopted Resolution R93-638 initiating the Meadows Phase 6 Street Lighting District and directed the City Engineer to make a survey and file a written report with the City Recorder. This Council action was taken in response to a petition from the property owners requesting the formation of a lighting district.

FISCAL IMPACT:

There is no direct fiscal impact on the City aside from the cost of preparing the City Engineer's report which runs approximately $150 to $200, which is reimbursed during the first year. The City receives reimbursement from the property owners for electrical costs through assessments placed on the tax rolls each year. Spreading of the lighting district assessments on the annual basis takes a minimal amount of staff time when the assessments are made on a per lot basis. All activity is budgeted through the Utility Fund.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended City Council adopt the Resolution setting the public hearing for August 2, 1993 and directing the City Recorder to provide notice of the public hearing and notice of proposed assessments to the property owners.

City of Keizer

Administration
930 Chemawa Rd. N.E. • P.O. Box 21000
Keizer, Oregon 97307-1000 • (503) 390-3700

ENGINEER'S REPORT

FOR

THE MEADOWS PHASE 6

STREET LIGHTING DISTRICT

For Keizer City Council Action on June 28, 1993

REGISTERED PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER
6744
OREGON
JULY 17, 1970
RUSSELL W. FAUST

WILLIAM L. PATTERSON
ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS INC.

Date: June 28, 1993

Project File: 93-0248

3863 RIVER RD. N. KEIZER, OR. 97303
(503) 390-7402 FAX # (503) 390-7401

June 28, 1993

TO: Mayor Dennis Koho and Keizer City Council

FROM: William I. Peterson, PE
Keizer City Engineer

SUBJECT: Street Lighting District for The Meadows Phase 6

Authority and Purpose

This report is being submitted in accordance with the requirements of City of Keizer Ordinance No. 87-094 for the purpose of creating the The Meadows Phase 6 Street Lighting District.

District Boundaries and Map

A map of the proposed district is attached showing the areas to be benefited by the proposed street lights.

Lighting Plan Alternatives

The lighting improvements will consist of nine, 100 Watt HPS (High Pressure Sodium) luminaries mounted on four foot long mast arms and attached to 25 foot aluminum poles. These components have been selected in order to maintain consistency between proposed and existing street light districts within the City of Keizer. Gray fiberglass poles may be substituted for aluminum poles at a cost savings.

Installation may be accomplished by any of the following three methods:

Method A

Portland General Electric would supply , install and maintain all luminaries, poles and underground or overhead wiring in the The Meadows Phase 6 Street Light District. PGE would also supply the electrical power to the district.

Method B

The City of Keizer would purchase all poles and luminaries from PGE, and would then contract with PGE for the installation, maintenance, and power supply in the The Meadows Phase 6 Street Light District.

Method C

The City of Keizer would purchase all poles and luminaries from PGE, as well as provide the maintenance for the district. PGE would not install the street lights if this option is chosen, and the city would have to contract out for their installation.

ESTIMATED COSTS:

The policy of the City of Keizer has been to allow local electric companies to install, maintain, and supply power to subdivisions by renting all streetlights (Method A). The costs associated with this method are as follows:

Annual Costs

Rent 3 - 100 watt HPS streetlights w/ aluminum poles $42.58 / month	$1924.56
Annual Operating Cost @ 10%[1]	$481.14
Total Assessable Costs	$2405.70
Cost per Lot per yr. for 31 lots =	$77.60

Note 1 Includes engineering, tax roll preparation, audit, delinquencies and miscellaneous administrative costs to the city in the first year. In succeeding years the annual cost may be expected to be reduced to approximately 40% of the first year cost.

Cost Estimates for Methods B and C were not obtained from PGE, and are therefore not included in this engineers report.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Street Light Poles
Gray light poles can be substituted for aluminum at a cost savings, but would not maintain continuity within The Meadows subdivision. Aluminum light poles are also preferred by Keizer officials in order to maintain overall continuity within the city. For these reasons, we recommend aluminum light poles for The Meadows Phase 6.

Method of Installation
As engineers for the City of Keizer we recommend the City of Keizer adopt the Method A described in this report in the formation of the The Meadows Phase 6 Street Light District. The annual costs for methods B and C are not included in this report, but would be lower than the costs included for Method A. However, Method A avoids the large initial investment that the other methods place on the City of Keizer. By choosing Method A the city does not become involved in the ownership of street light districts, and maintains its general philosophy of contracting with local electric companies for the installation and maintenance of street light districts, as well as the maintaining the necessary supply of power to those districts.

Method of Assessment
It is recommended that the costs be assessed equally to each lot or parcel in the district. The first year assessment would include the one time costs for engineering and district formation.

Assessment Roll
The attached preliminary assessment roll identifies the benefited properties and the recommended first year assessments to be levied against each owner.

Respectfully submitted,

Russ Faust, PE

PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT ROLL for:

The Meadows Phase 6 Street Lighting District

Located in Section 34, Township 7 South, Range 3 West, W.M. in the City of Keizer, Marion County, Oregon.

Total to be Assessed: $2405.70

LOT(s)	OWNERS *	COST/LOT	TOTAL
1-31	The Meadows Group DBA PO Box 21209 Keizer, Or. 97307	$ 77.60	$ 2405.70
31 LOTS		**TOTAL**	**$ 2405.70**

CITY COUNCIL, CITY OF KEIZER, STATE OF OREGON

Resolution R93-____

THE MEADOWS PHASE 6 STREET LIGHTING DISTRICT

BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Keizer, Oregon:

Section 1. That the City Council hereby finds the preliminary plans, an estimate of probable costs contained in the City Engineer's report for The Meadows Phase 6 Street Lighting District which was filed with the City Recorder on June 16, 1993 to be satisfactory, and the same are hereby approved and adopted.

Section 2. That the City Council hereby declares its intention to make the lighting district improvements to serve The Meadows Phase 6 Street Lighting District and hereby declares that the improvements to be made shall consist of nine (9) 100 watt high pressure sodium luminaries and mounted on 4 foot long mast arms and attached to 25 foot aluminum poles within the district, all in accordance with the aforesaid preliminary plans with the initial cost of installation to be borne by Portland General Electric and the operational and electrical power costs estimated at $2,646.27 the first year and $2,405.70 in subsequent years to be assessed against the properties benefitting from the improvements.

Section 3. That the City Council hereby directs the City Recorder to give notice of intention to make the improvements by publication once each week for two (2) successive weeks in a newspaper of general circulation in the City of Keizer stating a public hearing will be held on August 2, 1993, said notice to also provide that information required under City of Keizer Ordinance 87-094, an ordinance providing for procedures for municipal lighting districts and special assessments.

Section 4. That the City Council hereby directs the City Recorder to mail notice of the proposed assessments to each owner in the local improvement district with notice that any objections to the Engineer's Report and the proposed assessment will be considered by the City Council at the aforesaid August 2, 1993 public hearing.

Section 5. That the City Council may abandon the proceedings for the lighting district improvements if sufficient property owner support for the local improvement district does not materialize.

Section 6. If any section, subsection, sentence, clause or phrase of this resolution is for any reason held to be invalid or unconstitutional by the decision of any court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of the resolution. The City Council hereby declares that it would have passed this resolution and each section, subsection, sentence, clause or phrase thereof irrespective of the fact that any one or more sections, subsections, sentences, clauses or phrases be declared invalid or unconstitutional.

PASSED this _____ day of ________________, 1993.

SIGNED this _____ day of ________________, 1993

____
Mayor

____
City Recorder

City of Keizer

1982

930 Chemawa Rd. N.E. • P.O. Box 21000
Keizer, Oregon 97307-1000 • (503) 390-3700 • Fax # 393-9437

COUNCIL MEETING: June 21, 1993

AGENDA ITEM NUMBER: 9c

TO: MAYOR KOHO AND CITY COUNCIL

THROUGH: DOTTY TRYK
CITY MANAGER

FROM: TRACY L. DAVIS
CITY RECORDER

SUBJECT: MAX COURT STREET LIGHTING DISTRICT

ISSUE:

Review the City Engineer's report filed for Max Court Street Lighting District and consider a Resolution to adopt this report and to set a public hearing date to receive remonstrances to the project.

BACKGROUND:

On May 17, 1993, the City Council adopted Resolution R93-637 initiating Max Court Street Lighting District and directed the City Engineer to make a survey and file a written report with the City Recorder. This Council action was taken in response to a petition from the property owners requesting the formation of a lighting district.

FISCAL IMPACT:

There is no direct fiscal impact on the City aside from the cost of preparing the City Engineer's report which runs approximately $150 to $200, which is reimbursed during the first year. The City receives reimbursement from the property owners for electrical costs through assessments placed on the tax rolls each year. Spreading of the lighting district assessments on the annual basis takes a minimal amount of staff time when the assessments are made on a per lot basis. All activity is budgeted through the Utility Fund.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended City Council adopt the Resolution setting the public hearing for August 2, 1993 and directing the City Recorder to provide notice of the public hearing and notice of proposed assessments to the property owners.

City of Keizer
Administration
930 Chemawa Rd. N.E. • P.O. Box 21000
Keizer, Oregon 97307-1000 • (503) 390-3700

ENGINEER'S REPORT

FOR

MAX COURT

STREET LIGHTING DISTRICT

For Keizer City Council Action on June 28, 1993

REGISTERED PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER
6744
OREGON
JULY 17, 1970
RUSSELL W. FAUST

WILLIAM I. PETERSSON
ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS INC.

Date: June 28, 1993

Project File: 93-0249

3853 RIVER RD. N. KEIZER, OR. 97303
(503) 390-7402 FAX # (503) 390-7401

June 28, 1993

TO: Mayor Dennis Koho and Keizer City Council

FROM: William I. Peterson, PE
Keizer City Engineer

SUBJECT: Street Lighting District for Max Court Subdivision

Authority and Purpose

This report is being submitted in accordance with the requirements of City of Keizer Ordinance No. 87-094 for the purpose of creating the Max Court Street Lighting District.

District Boundaries and Map

A map of the proposed district is attached showing the areas to be benefited by the proposed street lights.

Lighting Plan Alternatives

The lighting improvements will consist of three, 100 Watt HPS (High Pressure Sodium) luminaries mounted on four foot long mast arms and attached to 25 foot aluminum poles. These components have been selected in order to maintain consistency between proposed and existing street light districts within the City of Keizer. Gray fiberglass poles may be substituted for aluminum poles at a cost savings, but would deviate from the current city preference.

Installation may be accomplished by any of the following three methods:

Method A

Portland General Electric would supply , install and maintain all luminaries, poles and underground or overhead wiring in the Max Court Street Light District. PGE would also supply the electrical power to the district.

Method B

The City of Keizer would purchase all poles and luminaries from PGE, and would then contract with PGE for the installation, maintenance, and power supply in the Max Court Street Light District.

Method C

The City of Keizer would purchase all poles and luminaries from PGE, as well as provide the maintenance for the district. PGE would not install the street lights if this option is chosen, and the city would have to contract out for their installation.

ESTIMATED COSTS:

The policy of the City of Keizer has been to allow local electric companies to install, maintain, and supply power to subdivisions by renting all streetlights (Method A). The costs associated with this method are as follows:

Annual Costs

Rent 3 - 100 watt HPS streetlights w/ aluminum poles $42.58 / month	$510.96
Annual Operating Cost @ 10%[1]	$127.74
Total Assessable Costs	$638.70
Cost per Lot per yr. for 10 lots =	$63.78

Note 1 Includes engineering, tax roll preparation, audit, delinquencies and miscellaneous administrative costs to the city in the first year. In succeeding years the annual cost may be expected to be reduced to approximately 40% of the first year cost.

Cost Estimates for Methods B and C were not obtained from PGE, and are therefore not included in this engineers report.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Assessment of Existing Houses

Lots seven and eight of Max Court Subdivision have existing houses facing Chehalis Dr. It is our recommendation that these lots be excluded from the assessment of costs for the Max Court Street Light District because these lots will not receive any direct benefit from the streetlights.

Method of Installation
As engineers for the City of Keizer we recommend the City of Keizer adopt the Method A described in this report in the formation of the Max Court Street Light District. The annual costs for methods B and C are not included in this report, but would be lower than the costs included for Method A. However, Method A avoids the large initial investment that the other methods place on the City of Keizer. By choosing Method A the city does not become involved in the ownership of street light districts, and maintains its general philosophy of contracting with local electric companies for the installation and maintenance of street light districts, as well as the maintaining the necessary supply of power to those districts.

Method of Assessment
It is recommended that the costs be assessed equally to each lot or parcel in the district. The first year assessment would include the one time costs for engineering and district formation.

Assessment Roll
The attached preliminary assessment roll identifies the benefited properties and the recommended first year assessments to be levied against each owner.

Respectfully submitted,

Russ Faust, PE

PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT ROLL for:

Max Court Street Lighting District

Located in Section 34, Township 7 South, Range 3 West, W.M. in the City of Keizer, Marion County, Oregon.

Total to be Assessed: $638.70

LOT(s)	OWNERS *	COST/LOT	TOTAL
1	Robert and Cynde Alt 3505 Jack St. N Keizer, Or. 97303	$ 63.78	$ 63.78
2-5	Print-Tek West Inc. 2746 Front St. NE Salem, Or. 97303	$ 63.78	$ 255.12
8-11	Print-Tek West Inc. 2746 Front St. NE Salem, Or. 97303	$ 63.78	$ 255.12
12	Robert and Cynde Alt 3505 Jack St. N Keizer, Or. 97303	$ 63.78	$ 63.78
10 LOTS		**TOTAL**	**$ 638.70**

CITY COUNCIL, CITY OF KEIZER, STATE OF OREGON

Resolution R93-____

MAX COURT STREET LIGHTING DISTRICT

BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Keizer, Oregon:

Section 1. That the City Council hereby finds the preliminary plans, an estimate of probable costs contained in the City Engineer's report for Max Court Street Lighting District which was filed with the City Recorder on June 16, 1993 to be satisfactory, and the same are hereby approved and adopted.

Section 2. That the City Council hereby declares its intention to make the lighting district improvements to serve Max Court Street Lighting District and hereby declares that the improvements to be made shall consist of three (3) 100 watt high pressure sodium luminaries and mounted on 4 foot long mast arms and attached to 25 foot aluminum poles within the district, all in accordance with the aforesaid preliminary plans with the initial cost of installation to be borne by Portland General Electric and the operational and electrical power costs estimated at $702.57 the first year and $638.70 in subsequent years to be assessed against the properties benefitting from the improvements.

Section 3. That the City Council hereby directs the City Recorder to give notice of intention to make the improvements by publication once each week for two (2) successive weeks in a newspaper of general circulation in the City of Keizer stating a public hearing will be held on August 2, 1993, said notice to also provide that information required under City of Keizer Ordinance 87-094, an ordinance providing for procedures for municipal lighting districts and special assessments.

Section 4. That the City Council hereby directs the City Recorder to mail notice of the proposed assessments to each owner in the local improvement district with notice that any objections to the Engineer's Report and the proposed assessment will be considered by the City Council at the aforesaid August 2, 1993 public hearing.

Section 5. That the City Council may abandon the proceedings for the lighting district improvements if sufficient property owner support for the local improvement district does not materialize.

Section 6. If any section, subsection, sentence, clause or phrase of this resolution is for any reason held to be invalid or unconstitutional by the decision of any court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of the resolution. The City Council hereby declares that it would have passed this resolution and each section, subsection, sentence, clause or phrase thereof irrespective of the fact that any one or more sections, subsections, sentences, clauses or phrases be declared invalid or unconstitutional.

PASSED this _____ day of ________________, 1993.

SIGNED this _____ day of ________________, 1993

.

____
Mayor

____
City Recorder

MINUTES

KEIZER CITY COUNCIL
Monday, June 7, 1993
Robert L. Simon Council Chambers
Keizer City Hall

CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Koho called the regular meeting to order at 7:33 p.m. Roll call was taken as follows:

Present
Dennis Koho, Mayor
Jim Keller, Councilor
Jerry McGee, Councilor
Al Miller, Councilor (arrived at 8:57 p.m.)
Chet Patterson, Councilor
Jerry Watson, Councilor
Marlene Wellin, Councilor

Staff
Dotty Tryk, City Manager
John Morgan, Community Development Director
Wally Mull, Director of Public Works
Charles Stull, Chief of Police
Shannon Johnson, City Attorney
Tracy L. Davis, City Recorder

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Manual Martinez, 1747 Meadowlark Drive NE, Keizer spoke to the Council concerning a letter he had received from the Public Works Department regarding debris found in a storm drain near his home. Mr. Martinez will meet with the City Manager and Public Works Director to discuss this matter further.

Kay Free, 4764 Riverwood Drive, Keizer voiced her concerns for citations being issued that are beyond the scope of the infraction that has been committed. She does not want to see the community labeled as a speed trap. Mayor Koho advised Ms. Free he would pass her concerns to the Community Policing Committee that will be formed soon.

Dennis Spencer, 4785 Riverwood Drive, Keizer cited his concern for the lack of enforcement of illegal parking in a handicap zone. He is partially disabled and uses these spaces frequently. He would be interested in participating in a program to allow citizens to patrol the handicap parking spaces in Keizer. Mayor Koho will ask the Keizer Police Department to consider such a program.

Jim Mikesh, 1726 Meadowlark Drive NE, Keizer complained to the Council regarding storm drains problems he has encountered over the years. Mayor Koho suggested he meet with the City Manager and Public Works Director to try to resolve this issue.

There was no other testimony to come before the Council.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

City Manager, Dotty Tryk reported U.S. West has offered the City a special portion of the reference section in the next edition of the phone book due to the spelling error in the current issue.

Five Year Service Award

Beverly Birr, Support Specialist with the Keizer Police Department, was the recipient of a five year service award. Mayor Koho presented a plaque to Ms. Birr.

Volunteer of the Month Award

Rosemary Emmerich was the recipient of the volunteer of the month award for June. Ms. Emmerich volunteers her time in the administration department at City Hall. Mayor Koho presented her with a clock in honor of her service to the City.

Tree Ordinance Task Force Report

Councilor Miller reported the Tree Ordinance Task Force had reviewed several ordinances from other cities. The Task Force has agreed by consensus on their direction and Mr. Miller will be drafting an Ordinance for review.

ORDINANCE - Property Access; Larsen Subdivision

Mayor Koho advised the Ordinance was before the Council this evening for second reading.

Councilor Patterson moved for approval of a bill for an Ordinance relating to the sale of city property located at the corner of Brandon Street and 19th Court to Marvin R. Larsen. Councilor McGee seconded the Motion.

The Motion passed with the following votes:

AYES: Keller, Koho, McGee, Patterson and Wellin (5)
NAYS: Watson (1)
ABSTENTIONS: None
ABSENT: Miller (1)

ORDINANCE - Zone Change Larsen Subdivision

Councilor Patterson moved for approval of a bill for an Ordinance in the matter of the application of Marvin R. Larsen for a zone change from UT (Urban Transition) to RL (Low Density Residential) on 3.05 acres of property in which the City recommends approval of the zone change requested in accordance with the Keizer Hearings Officer's Order dated April 29, 1993. Councilor Keller seconded the Motion.

The Motion passed with the following votes:

AYES: Keller, Koho, McGee, Patterson, Watson and Wellin (6)
NAYS: None (0)
ABSTENTIONS: None
ABSENT: Miller (1)

DISCUSSION

Keizer Heritage Use Agreement

City Attorney, Shannon Johnson reported the Agreement between the City and the Keizer Heritage Foundation has been discussed over the last several months. A settlement has been reached to set the initial term of the agreement at ten years. Thereafter the agreement may be terminated by either party without cause with a one-year notice of such termination. Other areas discussed and agreed upon dealt with tenants of the building, completion of building and landscaping work and maintenance of Fernwood Park.

Councilor Watson voiced his concerns the agreement may be terminated without cause but the City will be required to hold a public hearing. He feels this is contradictory language and ask the file to reflect the intention so it will be clear for future reference.

Councilor McGee asked for input from members of the Keizer Heritage Board.

Don Gribsco, Perkins Street, Keizer stated he has been involved with the Foundation since the beginning. He is concerned the agreement could be terminated without cause and the Foundation would suffer from loss of time and investments.

John Jenkin, 403 Straw Drive North, Keizer thinks the agreement is a big step forward from the original agreement. He has a problem with the wording but has faith legal counsel would correctly interpret the meaning in the future. In response to a question from Councilor Patterson, Mr. Jenkin stated the term of the agreement may cause problems for the Foundation to obtain grant money.

<u>Councilor McGee moved for a Resolution to authorize the Mayor and City Manager to sign the Keizer Heritage Foundation Use Agreement (Fernwood Park). Mayor Koho seconded the Motion.</u>

<u>Councilor Watson moved to amend section 25 to state the agreement may be terminated for cause.</u>

Councilor Watson then asked to withdraw his amendment. Mayor Koho suggested memos be directed to the file to clarify cause does not mean without reason.

Holly Erickson, 4775 Verda Lane, Keizer asked the Council to insert the word "initial" prior to ten year period in section 25 of the agreement. With this addition, she feels they would have a better chance of obtaining grants.

Councilor Keller voiced his support for the foundation and felt they should be recognized for their accomplishments towards their goal.

Councilor Keller moved to amend section 25 of the agreement by adding the word initial prior to ten years. The Council agreed to this change by consensus.

The main motion passed with the following votes:

AYES: Keller, Koho, McGee, Patterson, Watson and Wellin (6)
NAYS: None (0)
ABSTENTIONS: None
ABSENT: Miller (1)

Housing Issues

John Morgan, Community Development Director reported a regular Council session was held in November of 1992 that focused directly on the quality of housing in Keizer and the needs to provide some intervention to assure continued maintenance of the housing stock. The report found the housing stock in Keizer in good condition with some notable exceptions. Mr. Morgan stated the City has received numerous complaints regarding housing conditions over the last two years. As part of the North Willamette Valley Housing Coalition, formed to help study some of these problems, a draft Chronic Nuisance Ordinance has been developed and will be brought before the Council on June 21, 1993.

Keizer has been offered an opportunity to participate in the HOME program with the City of Salem through the formation of a Salem/Keizer Housing Consortium. Salem would benefit by receiving added funds with the addition of Keizer's population and housing needs. Salem would manage administration of projects and administration of the program for Keizer. Mr. Morgan stated in order to get into this program, Keizer will need to create a Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS). If done in conjunction with Salem, the CHAS will have a cost of approximately $3000. The

City will be eligible for other areas of funding such as block grants if a CHAS is in place. Mr. Morgan assured the Council Keizer would have complete control over projects within the city limits. Mr. Morgan recommended the Council adopt a resolution to authorize an intergovernmental agreement with the City of Salem to establish a Housing Consortium.

Councilor Keller confirmed this program would be identified as a Salem-Keizer program. Mr. Morgan stated Keizer would be identified in all information and Keizer could counsel citizens about the program but actual administration would be through the City of Salem.

Councilor McGee supports the concept of the Chronic Nuisance Ordinance but would like to have staff complete a cost impact on licensing of multi-family housing. He voiced his concerns for entering an agreement with the City of Salem to establish a housing consortium.

(Councilor Miller arrived at 8:57 p.m.)

City Manager, Dotty Tryk advised the Council if the City had a CHAS in place we would be able to take the first step to identify the housing needs of the citizens of Keizer.

Councilor Keller asked if we would need to have the CHAS in place in order to be eligible for CDBG money. Mr. Morgan confirmed this statement and stated it will also open Keizer up for other opportunities.

Councilor Patterson stated this would give the City a mechanism to start solving some of the issues we have encountered. It is a minimum investment to start helping residents. Councilor Keller agreed stating this would give Keizer a good first step.

Councilor McGee does not feel comfortable at this time to enter into such an agreement until further research is conducted.

<u>Councilor McGee moved to table this matter until further research can be done. Councilor Miller seconded the Motion.</u>

The Motion passed with the following votes:

AYES: McGee, Miller, Watson and Wellin (4)
NAYS: Keller, Koho and Patterson (3)
ABSTENTIONS: None
ABSENT: None

The Chair declared the Motion out of order because a main motion was not on the floor.

Councilor McGee moved to refer this matter back to staff for additional information. Mayor Koho seconded the Motion.

Councilor Watson asked this matter to come back to Council in two weeks.

Councilor Miller stated he is interested in assistance for the elderly and low income home owners but not large multi-family, low-income housing projects. Councilor Wellin hoped Keizer would adopt a program that would assist the elderly.

The Motion passed unanimously as follows:

AYES: Keller, Koho, McGee, Miller, Patterson, Watson and Wellin (7)
NAYS: None (0)
ABSTENTIONS: None
ABSENT: None

Preparation for June 10 LCDC Meeting Concerning Keizer's Periodic Review

John Morgan, Community Development Director advised the Council the Land Conservation and Development Commission found three parts of the Keizer Comprehensive Plan at fault during the Periodic Review process.

-There needs to be stronger language to reinforce the requirement that all four urban area jurisdictions must concur in any amendment to the urban growth boundary.

In 1986, Salem removed land from the boundary due to the belief there was too much land within the boundaries. Salem adopted the last out-first in policy saying it will look to these lands first and no other land has priority over these lands. During the Periodic Review process, Keizer asked to be severed from this policy. Mr. Morgan would like to argue this point further before the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC).

-The zoning ordinance needs more clear and objective standards to guide rezoning to allow needed housing.

Mr. Morgan stated almost all of the vacant developable land in Keizer is zoned Urban Transition, a holding zone. When plans are proposed for development, the appropriate zone change is granted. This allows Keizer the capability to tailor each of the zone changes. LCDC believes this makes zone changes a political decision. Staff would like to impose an objective process to deal with these issues.

-A regional economic development strategy will be developed to guide future land use decisions relative to industrial lands. In the interim land will be protected from land divisions and rezoning according to existing policy.

This point deals with the 67-acre industrial park (Epping property) along River Road. The City feels this is not an appropriate industrial site and zoning should be replaced to fit the City's need. LCDC is not disagreeing with the facts of the case but the Project 90 policy established the need for this industrial land within Keizer. Mr. Morgan feels the policy has failed and should be updated.

Mr. Morgan asked for authorization to represent the City's views on these three points before the LCDC on Thursday, June 10, 1993.

Mayor Koho voiced his concerns that LCDC should not conduct planning for the City of Keizer. He feels it would be a mistake to allow the 67 acre parcel to be developed as an industrial park. Keizer should argue for no limitations on the City's capability to re-zone the property.

Councilor McGee moved to authorize staff to represent the views of the City Council before the Land Conservation and Development Commission at the meeting on June 10, 1993. Councilor Patterson seconded the Motion.

Councilor McGee stated Mr. Morgan has been involved in this matter and understands the Council's position. He will represent the Council's views and position on the 67-acre industrial (Epping) property and other issues.

Mayor Koho clarified Mr. Morgan will argue the City's position before the LCDC and hopes he will not negotiate or compromise on the industrial land issues.

The Motion passed with the following votes:

AYES: Keller, Koho, McGee, Miller, Patterson, Watson and Wellin (7)
NAYS: None (0)
ABSTENTIONS: None
ABSENT: None

CONSENT CALENDAR

The Consent Calendar consisted of the following:

a. RESOLUTION - Cherrylawn Court Street Lighting District

b. RESOLUTION - Appletree Estates Street Lighting District

c. RESOLUTION - Rivercrest Street Lighting District

d. Approval of May 17, 1993 Regular Session Minutes

Councilor Patterson moved for approval of the consent calendar. Councilor Watson seconded the Motion.

The Motion passed unanimously as follows:

AYES: Keller, Koho, McGee, Miller, Patterson, Watson and Wellin (7)
NAYS: None (0)
ABSTENTIONS: None
ABSENT: None

OTHER BUSINESS

Councilor Keller asked for an update with the situation at the hydrotube. Wally Mull, Public Works Director reported he had met with Mr. Folger, owner of the property, and he is considering erecting a fence and hiring a private security company to patrol the area on a regular basis.

Councilor Keller asked the status of the burned house at Chemawa Road. City Manager, Dotty Tryk reported the owner has given the City permission to proceed with required inspections and destruction. A lien will be placed against the property to cover related expenses the City will incur.

Councilor Miller reported he had received several complaints of the poor road conditions on Chemawa Road. Wally Mull advised the Council the patches are temporary and the final overlay is scheduled for August.

Mayor Koho reminded the Council of the upcoming appointments to the Community Policing Committee. Interested citizens should contact City Hall for an application.

Mayor Koho also reminded the Council of the outstanding deficit from the levy campaign. Donations may be sent to Carl Beach or Mayor Koho.

WRITTEN COMUNICATION

There was no written communication to come before the Council.

AGENDA INPUT

Mayor Koho advised the Council the worksession on June 14, 1993 will start at 6:30 p.m. to allow the Mayor of Salem to address the Council.

Councilor McGee asked the Council to consider at the June 21 Council meeting not assessing the full amount of the levy by reducing the uncollectibles, income from franchise fees, and COLA.

ADJOURNMENT The meeting was adjourned at 10:07 p.m.

____

TRACY L. DAVIS
City Recorder

APPROVED:

MAYOR:

PUBLIC HEARING REGARDING: URBAN RENEWAL BUDGET (93-94) DATE: 6-21-93

BEFORE: Urban Renewal Board PLACE: Council Chambers TIME: 7:00pm

PRINTED NAME	MAILING ADDRESS	PROPONENT	OPPONENT	GENERAL

No sign ups!

PUBLIC HEARING REGARDING: SUPPLEMENTAL BILL PLACE: Council Chambers TIME:

BEFORE: City Council

PRINTED NAME	MAILING ADDRESS	PROPONENT	OPPONENT	GENERAL
~~PAUL ORCUTT~~	~~6833 ROCKLEDGE CT NE~~			

No sign ups!

PUBLIC HEARING REGARDING: Neighborhood Associations DATE: 6-21-93

BEFORE: Council PLACE: Council Chambers TIME: 7:30pm

PRINTED NAME	MAILING ADDRESS	PROPONENT	OPPONENT	GENERAL
No sign ups!				

City of Keizer

Community Development Department

MEMORANDUM

DATE: June 18, 1993

TO: River Road Redevelopment Board

FROM: John N. Morgan, AICP
Community Development Director

SUBJECT: Information

Please find enclosed a copy of the Urban Renewal Agency (City Council) agenda packet for Monday, June 21. I decided to send you all copies since there is a lot of interesting information on the agenda. Please note the proposed 93-94 budget is included. There will be a public hearing and decision on the Budget by the Agency Board, so if you have any comments please bring them to the meeting Monday night.

We will have the full offering packet for the bond sale probably next week. As you know, we planned on having it earlier, but we are watching the Legislature very carefully to see what may come out that may impact tax increment revenues. The complexities are incredible and since the offering packet must disclose absolutely everything that may impact the sale, we are being very careful. Obviously trying to disclose in the document what the Legislature is doing is a bit of a trick! Luckily our bond counsel is working on a flat fee!!

We now hope to take the resolution authorizing the bond sale to the Council on July 6. I will have copies of the complete agenda packet for you at your meeting July 7.

Thanks!

CITY OF KEIZER MISSION STATEMENT

KEEP CITY GOVERNMENT COSTS AND SERVICES TO A MINIMUM BY PROVIDING BASIC CITY SERVICES TO THE COMMUNITY IN A COORDINATED, EFFICIENT AND LEAST COST FASHION

A G E N D A

URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY OF THE CITY OF KEIZER

Monday, June 21, 1993
7:00 p.m.
Robert L. Simon Council Chambers
Keizer City Hall
Keizer, Oregon 97303

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

2. **ROLL CALL**

3. **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

   This time is provided for citizens to address the Urban Renewal Agency on matters not on the agenda.

4. **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

   a. 1993-94 Urban Renewal Budget

5. **DELIBERATION**

   a. RESOLUTION - Adopting 1993-94 Urban Renewal Budget

6. **DISCUSSION**

   a. RESOLUTION - Transferring Appropriations

   b. Appointment to R3B Board Position #2

   c. Project Status Report

   d. Bond Sale Report

7. **CONSENT CALENDAR**

   a. Approval of March 15, 1993 Agency Minutes

   b. Approval of March 22, 1993 Agency Minutes

8. **OTHER BUSINESS**

   This time is provided to allow Urban Renewal Agency members the opportunity to bring matters before the Agency which are not on tonight's agenda.

9. **WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS**

   To inform the Urban Renewal Agency of significant written communications and petitions.

10. **ADJOURN**

City of Keizer
1982
930 Chemawa Rd. N.E. • P.O. Box 21000
Keizer, Oregon 97307-1000 • (503) 390-3700 • Fax # 393-9437

URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY MEETING: June 21, 1993

AGENDA ITEM NUMBER: 4a & 5a

TO: CHAIRMAN KOHO AND BOARD MEMBERS

FROM: DOTTY TRYK Dotty
CITY MANAGER

SUBJECT: RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE FY'94 BUDGET, MAKING APPROPRIATIONS AND LEVYING TAXES

BACKGROUND:

The Agency Budget Committee, comprised of the Board and seven lay members, reviewed the Recommended Budget for Fiscal Year 1994 and approved it for Board consideration. A public hearing is scheduled for June 21, 1993 for the purpose of hearing public input and adopting a budget.

One change to the FY'94 Budget should be made. This is the second year of reimbursement to the General Fund for funding the original Urban Renewal Plan. The addition to this budget would be in Transfer to General Fund in the amount of $9,148. This change has been included in the appropriations resolution.

The Agency Board has the authority to adjust resources; reduce or eliminate any expenditure; or increase expenditures if it is by no more than 10% of the fund total.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends adoption of the Resolution containing the above adjustment.

KEIZER URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY BOARD, CITY OF KEIZER,

STATE OF OREGON

RESOLUTION R93-_____

ADOPTING THE FY'94 BUDGET, MAKING APPROPRIATIONS

AND LEVYING TAXES

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of the Keizer Urban Renewal Agency of the City of Keizer hereby adopts a budget for fiscal year 1993-94 in the sum of $4,350,582.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the amounts for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1993, and for the purposes shown below are hereby appropriated as follows:

TAX INCREMENT FUND		
Debt Service	1,176,459	
Transfers	700,000	
TOTAL TAX INCREMENT FUND		**1,876,459**
PROJECT FUND		
Renewal Projects	2,364,975	
Transfers	9,148	
Contingency	100,000	
TOTAL PROJECT FUND		**2,474,123**
TOTAL ALL FUNDS		**4,350,582**

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that all increment tax collections will be used to pay principal and interest on debt issues under Constitutional authority.

PASSED this ______ day of June, 1993.

SIGNED this ______ day of June, 1993.

____
Chairman

____
City Recorder

City of Keizer
1982
930 Chemawa Rd. N.E. • P.O. Box 21000
Keizer, Oregon 97307-1000 • (503) 390-3700 • Fax # 393-9437

URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY MEETING: June 21, 1993

AGENDA ITEM NUMBER: 6a

TO: CHAIRMAN KOHO AND AGENCY BOARD

FROM: DOTTY TRYK Dotty
CITY MANAGER

SUBJECT: RESOLUTION TRANSFERRING APPROPRIATIONS

BACKGROUND:

Oregon State Law allows for modifications to an adopted budget to adjust for events that were unanticipated at the time of adoption. This can be done through a transfer resolution.

Two things have occurred since the Urban Renewal Agency Budget was adopted in June 1992 that were not budgeted for and will exceed our legal appropriation authority if not adjusted. These are an increase in salaries for employees allocated to this activity and a transfer to the General Fund to partially reimburse it for the original study and plan. These appropriation changes can be made by transferring from the Capital Outlay category which will not be totally expended in this fiscal year.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the Agency adopt the Resolution.

URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY, CITY OF KEIZER, STATE OF OREGON

Resolution R93-____

TRANSFERRING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1992-93

WHEREAS, the Keizer Urban Renewal Agency Board adopted a budget for the Agency for the 1992-93 fiscal year on September 21, 1992;

WHEREAS, there have been occurrences which were specifically anticipated at the time of the preparation of the budget for the 1992-93 fiscal year for the funds indicated below;

WHEREAS, ORS.294.450 (3) provides for the transfer of appropriations within a fund; **NOW, THEREFORE,**

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of the City of Keizer Urban Renewal Agency, that appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1993 be transferred in the amounts indicated below:

	Increase	**Decreace**
Personal Services	2,000	
Transfer to General Fund	9,148	
Capital Outlay	______	11,148
Total Tax Increment Fund	**11,148**	**11,148**

PASSED this __________ day of __________,1993

SIGNED this __________ day of __________,1993

____
Chair

____
City Recorder

1982

City of Keizer

930 Chemawa Rd. N.E. • P.O. Box 21000
Keizer, Oregon 97307-1000 • (503) 390-3700 • Fax # 393-9437

URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY BOARD MEETING: June 21, 1993

AGENDA ITEM NUMBER: 6b

TO: CHAIRMAN KOHO AND AGENCY BOARD MEMBERS

FROM: DOTTY TRYK Dotty
CITY MANAGER

SUBJECT: RIVER ROAD REDEVELOPMENT BOARD APPOINTMENT

Doug Gatchet recently submitted his resignation from the River Road Redevelopment Board. Since Mr. Gatchet was seated in position number 2 on the Board, Chet Patterson will nominate an individual to fill this vacancy.

City of Keizer
1982
930 Chemawa Rd. N.E. • P.O. Box 21000
Keizer, Oregon 97307-1000 • (503) 390-3700 • Fax # 393-9437

URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY MEETING: June 21, 1993

AGENDA ITEM NUMBER: 6c

TO: CHAIRMAN KOHO AND AGENCY BOARD MEMBERS

THROUGH: DOTTY TRYK Dotty
CITY MANAGER

FROM: JOHN N. MORGAN
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR

SUBJECT: URBAN RENEWAL PROJECT UPDATE STAFF REPORT

This report will update the Urban Renewal Agency Board on the various projects being undertaken by the Agency.

Storm Drain Construction

Plans have been completed except for one complication that recently arose. The optimum alignment of the east/west storm drain system from Cherry Avenue to the Willamette River along Plymouth and Apple Blossom conflicts with the optimum alignment for the north/south conduit system for the utility lines. This problem will be resolved, but it is causing a delay.

The engineering team is not concerned about the delay as construction on the storm drain cannot start until the super-saturated soils in the area "dry-out." The expectation is this will take at least another month. It is hoped a contract can be awarded at an Agency meeting July 19th.

Iris Lane Construction

Negotiations are continuing with the owners of Bi-Mart and the Marth's building for the necessary right-of-way. The issues center on minimizing the loss of parking spaces.

John Morgan met with Salem Area Seniors, Inc., to discuss the plans. Bill Peterson has discussed the driveway issues with the owner of the Iris Lane Cafe building.

It is anticipated this project will be under construction by Fall.

Undergrounding of Overhead Wiring

Extensive design work in cooperation with Salem Electric and PGE is coming to a close. The primary issues to be resolved center on acquiring easements and/or ownership of the sites for transformer pads and other above ground facilities.

The strategy being followed concentrates on the City installing the necessary conduit system in one construction effort. The utilities will follow "pulling wire" as their crews are available. It is anticipated this will take up to three years to complete, which is in conformance with the adopted Design Plan. It is hoped construction will begin by Fall.

Signal and Traffic Revisions

Preliminary designs for the new signals and revised intersections have been completed. The work to make these changes is tied to the "undergrounding" project, as the new conduit will house the wiring necessary to interconnect the signals. It is anticipated these changes will occur as other work occurs along the corridor.

Design Standards

The Planning Commission and River Road Redevelopment Board have been meeting in joint sessions and through a joint subcommittee to discuss the issues involved in establishing design standards for private development within the redevelopment district. This work has resulted in a draft ordinance which will be further reviewed over the summer. It is anticipated the groups will refer a final draft to the Council for consideration in September.

The draft ordinance has been presented to the Chamber Government Affairs Committee. GAC will review the work and prepare a recommendation for approval by the Chamber Board anticipating a response in time for use by both the Commission and R3B.

Access Control Standards

The same process and progress on design standards is being met in the effort to create access control standards. A draft ordinance has been prepared and is currently under consideration. As with design standards, it should be to the Council in September.

City of Keizer
1982
930 Chemawa Rd. N.E. • P.O. Box 21000
Keizer, Oregon 97307-1000 • (503) 390-3700 • Fax # 393-9437

URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY BOARD MEETING: June 21, 1993

AGENDA ITEM NUMBER: 6d

TO: CHAIRMAN KOHO AND AGENCY BOARD MEMBERS

FROM: DOTTY TRYK Dotty
CITY MANAGER

SUBJECT: BOND SALE REPORT

City Manager, Dotty Tryk will verbally update the Urban Renewal Agency Board on the status of the Bond sale at the meeting.

MINUTES

URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY OF THE CITY OF KEIZER
Monday, March 15, 1993
Robert L. Simon Council Chambers
Keizer City Hall

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Koho called the meeting to order at 6:10 p.m. Roll call was taken as follows:

Present
Dennis Koho, Chair
Jim Keller
Jerry McGee
Al Miller (arrived at 6:18 p.m.)
Chet Patterson
Jerry Watson (arrived at 7:19 p.m.)
Marlene Wellin

Staff
Dotty Tryk, City Manager
John Morgan, Community Development Director
John Lien, City Attorney
Tracy L. Davis, City Recorder

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

There was no public testimony to come before the agency.

DISCUSSION Major Renewal Plan Amendments

John Morgan, Community Development Director, stated the purpose of this meeting was to brief the Agency on the issues revolving around the Urban Renewal Plan before the Public Hearing next week. The two matters before the Agency for the hearing will deal with the Urban Renewal Plan and Major Amendments to the Plan.

The proposed administrative amendments to the Urban Renewal Plan involve:

Section 1000 (Section B) - Future Amendments. This section should be amended as follows: A - Adding land to the urban renewal area except for an addition of land that totals not more than one percent of the existing area of the urban renewal area. Also extending the date in Section 1102 of this plan, after which no bonded indebtedness shall be issued with respect to the plan or any project undertaken with respect to the plan.

Addition of Section 1102 - Latest Date for Issue of Bonded Indebtedness. This urban renewal plan calls for a division of ad valorem taxes under ORS 457.440. No bonded indebtedness shall be issued with respect to the plan, or any project undertaken with respect to the plan, later than 15 years following the adoption of this urban renewal plan.

New project activities will be added to Section 700 of the plan. These include:

Section 700 A.2 - Other Roadway Improvements:
e. Iris Lane - Construct a new road (tentatively called Iris Lane) through the Bi-Mart parking lot. The Iris Lane/River Road and Iris Lane/Cherry Avenue intersections will be signalized, and an existing signal will be removed. Iris Lane will be landscaped. Improvements will include road construction, landscaping, drainage, sidewalks, lighting, street furnishings, and signalization. Right-of-way will also be acquired.

Section 700 B.2 - Storm Drainage Improvements d. Construct a storm drainage line from Cherry Avenue west along Appleblossom Avenue to the Willamette River. Improvements to existing lines along Cherry Avenue are also included.

Section 700 F.1 - Property to be Acquired for Public Use. All or portions of the following tax lots will be acquired for the Iris Lane right-of-way:

Map		Tax Lot
7 3W 11 BB	500	
		600
		700
		800

1600
1700
1800

Mr. Morgan advised the Agency that notices were sent to all property owners within Keizer. The notice included language required by statute concerning possible impact on property taxes and the ordinance will be adopted which is subject to referendum.

Mr. Morgan outlined the report which backs up the amendments to the Keizer Renewal Plan; reflecting what has happened in the design plan process, what has happened with major amendments, updated the list of project activities and dollar estimates, estimated start and completion dates, the estimated amount of money required and year of debt retirement, impact on other taxing jurisdictions, and analysis of the feasibility of the plan.

Jerry McGee inquired of the uncollectible amount of ten percent in the financial outline. Dan Anderson stated this is a conservative approach used as a standard in Marion County. If the uncollectible rate is lower, the effect would allow the debt retirement to be speeded up.

RIVER ROAD DESIGN PLAN

Tom Bauer, Chair of the River Road Redevelopment Board, addressed the Agency on the process the Board has taken to bring this final plan document to the Agency for adoption.

John Morgan briefed the Agency on the specifics of the River Road Design Plan. Mr. Morgan pointed out that the purpose of the design plan is not to replace the Urban Renewal Plan but to take the list of projects in the Renewal Plan and decide what is to be built, arrange financing and direct the engineers to do their job.

The four program areas designed to improve River Road's economic environment are public infrastructure, traffic circulation, aesthetics, and community facilities. Mr. Morgan reported each of the strategies for these developments. Mr.

Morgan estimated ground breaking to occur by June 15, 1993.

Jim Keller inquired about plans for the sites of transit district pullouts. Mr. Morgan responded speicific sites have not been determined.

In response to a question from Al Miller, Mr. Morgan stated the property owner will be responsible for the landscaping and maintenance if the zoning ordinance was revised to require a five-foot landscape strip. Mr. Miller asked that the final plan include clarification for the responsibility of the wiring to the meter when wires are undergrounded.

Dick Woelk, City Traffic Engineer, stated the initial idea was to provide for smooth, safe and efficient traffic flow on River Road. River Road is a commuter road that signals are interconnected but does not operate very efficiently. A progression analysis was performed to show where the traffic flow problems are. Traffic is not contained in platoons as it travels along River Road, due to the inconsistent distance between signals. Mr. Woelk stated there is 2850 feet between the Sunset and Glynbrook signals instead of the average 1100 feet in other areas along River Road. He also completed a study of all the signalized intersections on River Road to determined if they met the 11 traffic signal warrants set by National Traffic Standards. During this study it was determined that the Sunset Signal did not meet any of the listed warrants and therefore should be removed.

A traffic delay study was also conducted on River Road and the average delay time to make a left turn on River Road from the Bi-Mart Parking lot was 15.43 seconds, Hollyhawk intersection was 8.8 seconds, and Sunset was 40 seconds. These averages were determined by observing over 500 instances.

Mr. Woelk stated that according to the Oregon Department of Transportation, over a five year period traffic accidents at the Sunset intersection were more significant than other intersections along River Road. Investigations showed the majority of these accidents were rear-end accidents within 50 feet of the intersection, probalby caused by the signal.

Mr. Woelk stated it is very important to have the signals interconnected. He showed time delay comparison charts with removal of the Sunset signal, removal of the left turn signal only, and the existing with no change. Mr. Woelk stated that if the left turn phase was removed from the Sunset signal the progression could work by raising the average speed to make the progression system work.

Responding to a questions from Dennis Koho, Mr. Woelk gave the history of the placement of the Sunset signal in 1981. Mr. Woelk also felt there would be minimal effect on the business at the Sunset intersection if the signal was removed. The signal at Iris Lane would meet all the required traffic warrants.

Mr. Woelk suggested the City adopt a driveway access management ordinance to control where access points are.

Mr. Woelk stated the 12th warrant for removal is the political aspect.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The Consent Calendar consisted of the following:

a. Approval of the February 16, 1993 Agency Minutes

<u>Al Miller moved to approve the item on the consent calendar. Chet Patterson seconded the Motion.</u>

<u>The Motion passed with the following votes:</u>

AYES: Keller, Koho, McGee, Miller, Patterson, Watson and Wellin (7)
NAYS: None
ABSTENTIONS: None
ABSENT: None (0)

OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business to come before the Agency.

WRITTEN

There was no written communication to come before the

COMUNICATION Agency.

ADJOURNMENT The Meeting was adjourned at 7:25 p.m.

TRACY L. DAVIS
City Recorder

APPROVED:

CHAIR:

MINUTES

URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY OF THE CITY OF KEIZER
Monday, March 22, 1993
Robert L. Simon Council Chambers
Keizer City Hall

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Koho called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m. Roll call was taken as follows:

Present
Dennis Koho, Chair
Jim Keller
Jerry McGee
Al Miller
Chet Patterson
Jerry Watson

Absent
Marlene Wellin

Staff
Dotty Tryk, City Manager
John Morgan, Community Development Director
Tracy L. Davis, City Recorder

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

There was no public testimony to come before the agency.

PUBLIC HEARING

Chair Koho opened the public hearing.

RIVER ROAD DESIGN PLAN

John Morgan, Community Development Director presented the final draft of the River Road Design Plan to the Agency outlining the strategy for implementation of the Renewal District.

Speaking at the public hearing were:

Donald Allenby, 284 Manbrin Drive N., Keizer voiced his concerns regarding the removal of the electric poles on River Road. He also stated he felt it was unnecessary pay for these improvements by issuing bonds. Mr. Alenbee was also concerned about the turn lane width on River Road for trucks and busses.

Mary Kincaid, 6219 14th Ave NE, Keizer as a retired citizen she cited her concerns for the rising taxes. When the City was incorporated, there were promises of lower taxes and now she feels betrayed by the addition of assessments. Ms. Kincaid feels that River Road should remain as it is today.

George Lyman, 4365 River Road N, Keizer uses Menlo Drive to safeguard funeral processions in route to the cemetery. He presented the Agency with a petition signed by 177 people located within the Menlo Drive area that are opposed to shutting off Menlo Drive west of River Road. Mr. Lyman inquired of concerns from the Fire and Police Department for emergency response.

Vera Beecroft, 190 Menlo Drive N, Keizer appeared before the River Road Redevelopment Board in October and November 1992 to voice her concerns for the closure of Menlo Drive and creation of a culdesac for parking. She asked if Menlo Drive is to be closed, only a barricade be erected. Ms. Beecroft is also disturbed about street closures being made on a case by case basis. She hopes that she will have additional input into the closure of Menlo Drive.

Mark Grenz, 1374 Riverwood Court, Keizer, spoke in support of the plan as a member of the River Road Redevelopment Board and also as a concerned citizen of Keizer. Mr. Grenz feels this is a good plan and allows him to fulfill some of his personal goals he set before becoming a member of the Board. He feels removal of the power poles will make the area more pleasing, improve the much needed drainage in the southern part of town, and the landscaping will improve the sights along River

Road. Mr. Grenz supports the removal of the traffic signal at Sunset Avenue and the creation of Iris Lane. He also stated if traffic signals are synchronized, it will lower the overall speed on River Road and create a safer environment for pedestrians.

Phil Bay, 4470 River Road N, Keizer addressed the Agency as a representive of the Keizer Chamber of Commerce. Mr. Bay stated the Renewal Plan was reviewed by the Board of Directors and they approved the overall concept of the River Road Design Plan. They believe upon the completion it will improve the business community, revitalize business economics and will give a facelift to River Road and create positive growth within the community. Mr. Bay asked the Agency to keep in mind the businesses that will be affected during the construction phases and also the economic hardship smaller business will face in the rewiring phases.

Dana Baugher, 507 Honeysuckle Street N, Keizer stated the City should consider buying a snow plow or other snow removal equipment instead of being concerned about the aesthetics of the area. In regards to the underground wiring, she stated that underground wire deteriorates faster than overhead and is disturbed about future replacement costs. Ms. Baugher also voiced her opposition for the removal of the traffic light at Sunset Drive and submitted petitions with 128 signatures of other concerned neighbors.

Phil Baugher, 507 Honeysuckle Street N, Keizer, said his main objective is to the removal of the traffic light at Sunset Drive. He hoped the Agency would consider the concerns of the citizens to keep the traffic light.

Patty Dela, 351 Sunset Avenue N, Keizer appeared before the Agency representing a large group of Sunset Avenue residents west of River Road. She submitted additional petitions in opposition of the removal of the Sunset Avenue signal. If the signal was removed, it would force the residents to travel south on River Road and shop in Salem. Ms. Dela also stated safety would be in jeopardy if the traffic signal was removed.

Lea Jenny, 350 Sunset Avenue N, Keizer voiced her objections to the removal of the traffic light at Sunset Avenue. She has watched Keizer grow and agrees a plan is needed. By removing the signal at Sunset, the safety of the residents would be increasingly jeopardized. Ms. Jenny is also concerned about the lack of improvements until 1997 to Cherry Avenue.

Gordon Beecroft, 190 Menlo Drive N, Keizer stated his concern for the proposed culdesac that is planned upon the closure of Menlo Drive. Mr. Beecroft does not see any benefit in the closure of Menlo Drive.

Ralph Nickerson, 3850 Rivercrest Drive N, Keizer voiced his concerns for the removal of the light at Sunset Avenue.

Ruth Palmer, 3945 5th Avenue N, Keizer believed the information provided supporting the removal of the signal at Sunset Avenue was inaccurate. Ms. Palmer also cited her concerns for the loss of bus service at Sunset Avenue and River Road.

Gary Steiner, 4054 Noon Avenue, Keizer stated his concerns are for bicycle safety along River Road due to lack of specified lanes for bicycles.

Joe Van Meter, 598 Dennis Lane, Keizer feels it is important to the residents of the Sunset Avenue area to maintain the traffic signal. The reason for Urban Renewal was to improve shopping within Keizer and by removing the signal, it will force these residents south into Salem.

Jan Eggert, River Road, Keizer recently purchased a business on River Road south of Sunset Avenue. She suggested the

Agency temporarily remove the signal at Sunset Avenue and then conduct a study of the traffic numbers. Ms. Eggert also supported the creation of Iris Lane and the placement of a signal at that intersection.

Richard Morgan, 1840 Claxter Road, Keizer spoke to the Agency as a member of the Keizer Lions Club. Mr. Morgan voiced his concerns for the safety of pedestrians along Cherry Avenue near the Lions Club.

Tom Bauer, chair of the River Road Redevelopment Board addressed the Agency. He stated there are several streets along River Road that are not signalized and it was not the intent to force the residents to travel south to Salem to shop. Mr. Bauer feels the plan is the best thing for Keizer and is proud to bring the Boards recommendation to the Agency.

Chair Koho closed the Public Hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING

Chair Koho opened the Public Hearing.

MAJOR AMENDMENTS TO THE NORTH RIVER ROAD ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AREA RENEWAL PLAN

John Morgan, Community Development Director, reported this hearing is necessary to incorporate major project activities that were not in the original renewal plan and to bring the legal and timing component requirements into conformance with the statutes. Mr. Morgan advised the Agency notification had been sent to other taxing jurisdictions within the area and he had not received any response. The Planning Commission and the River Road Redevelopment Board unanimously voted to recommend adoption of the proposed amendments of the renewal plan to the Agency. Mr. Morgan asked that any previous comments made during the Public Hearing dealing with taxation or Iris Lane be considered as part of the record of this hearing.

There was no testimony to come before the Agency.

Chair Koho closed the public hearing.

DELIBERATION

RIVER ROAD DESIGN PLAN

Dick Woelk, Traffic Engineer stated traffic could be synchronized to travel 30 mph with the traffic signal at Sunset Avenue, but the efficiency rate drops by 74 percent, increasing the overall delay on River Road; therefore there would be less delay if the signal at Sunset Avenue was removed.

Jim Keller inquired of the cause of the accidents in the analysis conducted at Sunset Avenue and River Road. Mr. Woelk stated the majority of the accidents were rear-end collisions and this accident rate is higher than any other signalized intersection in Keizer.

Jerry McGee asked Mr. Woelk's recommendation for removal vs nonremoval on a safety factor basis. Mr. Woelk stated that accident hazards are greater at an unsignalized than signalized intersection. Mr. McGee also asked if the light at Cherry/Manbrin intersection were removed and Iris Lane was created, would Mr. Woelk still recommend removal of the signal. Mr. Woelk stated it is possible the circumstances could change so the light did not have to be removed. Mr. Woelk stated if the Agency wished to conduct a test, the signal arms be removed for a minimum of one year.

In response to a question from Jerry Watson, Mr. Woelk stated the study was not conducted in the summer months when pedestrian traffic was at its peak.

Chet Patterson voiced his concern for the businesses in the Sunset Avenue area. He preferred to leave the light in place, remove the left turn signal, create Iris Lane, synchronize the lights, and review this issue in one year.

Al Miller asked if the accident rate would decrease once the synchronization of lights was done. Mr. Woelk stated you cannot synchronize in both directions at the same time so therefore it probably would not decrease.

<u>Jim Keller moved for a Resolution for Adoption of the River Road Design Plan. Dennis Koho seconded the Motion.</u>

Chet Patterson moved to amend the Resolution by amending page 14(1)(b) of the Plan; the Sunset signal remains without a left turn signal until a further study is completed. Al Miller seconded the Motion.

Chet Patterson hoped the traffic flow would settle and within one year's time the Agency could reevaluate the removal of the signal. Jerry McGee voiced his concerns for not having a true evaluation with the signal remaining. Mr. Woelk stated in order to determine the actual impact, the signal should be removed. Jim Keller stated the primary issue is safety and the only way to prevent the accidents is to remove the light from the intersection.

The amendment to the Motion passed with the following votes:

AYES: Koho, Miller, Patterson and Watson (4)
NAYS: Keller and McGee (2)
ABSTENTIONS: None
ABSENT: Wellin (1)

Jim Keller moved to amend the Plan on page 16; minor streets, such as Menlo, Evans, be removed. Jerry McGee seconded the Motion.

AYES: Keller, Koho, McGee, Miller, Patterson and Watson (6)
NAYS: None (0)
ABSTENTIONS: None
ABSENT: Wellin (1)

Al Miller moved to amend the plan by deleting the community center section under future phases strategy on page 28 of the Plan. Jim Keller seconded the Motion.

Al Miller explained this is costly and unnecessary to be listed in the plan. Also the City is growing northward and facilities should be centrally located within the City. Jerry Watson voiced his objection to the removal since this is not literally part of the plan, only to set the stage. Chet Patterson stated this is the part of the plan devoted to visionary rather than concrete items. John Morgan stated future phases could be drawn up in another plan.

The amendment to the Motion passed with the following votes:

AYES: Keller, Koho, McGee, and Miller (4)
NAYS: Patterson and Watson (2)
ABSTENTIONS: None
ABSENT: Wellin (1)

The original motion with the amendments passed as follows:

AYES: Keller, Koho, McGee, Miller, Patterson and Watson (6)
NAYS: None (0)
ABSTENTIONS: None (0)
ABSENT: Wellin (1)

MAJOR AMENDMENTS TO THE NORTH RIVER ROAD ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AREA RENEWAL PLAN

Chet Patterson moved for adoption of the Resolution for Recommendation on the First Amendment to the North River Road Economic Development Area Renewal Plan. Dennis Koho seconded the Motion.

The Motion passed as follows:

AYES: Keller, Koho, McGee, Miller, Patterson and Watson (6)
NAYS: None (0)
ABSTENTIONS: None
ABSENT: Wellin (1)

OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business to come before the Agency.

WRITTEN COMUNICATION

There was no written communication to come before the Agency.

ADJOURNMENT The Meeting was adjourned at 9:38 p.m.

TRACY L. DAVIS
City Recorder

APPROVED:

CHAIR:

(Marlene Wellin absent)