



CITY OF REDMOND
Community Development Department

716 SW Evergreen Avenue
Redmond, OR 97756-0100

(541) 923-7721
Fax: (541) 548-0706
cdd@ci.redmond.or.us
www.ci.redmond.or.us

DOWNTOWN URBAN RENEWAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Meeting Minutes
Monday, April 13, 2009 5:00 PM
Redmond Fire Station Training Room
341 Dogwood Avenue

ADVISORY MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair Margie Dawson, Vice Chair Krista Beale, Steven Boothroyd, Carol Nelson, Tory Allman, Ken Streater, Rachel Winkler

CITY COUNCILORS PRESENT: Camden King, Council Liaison

CITY STAFF PRESENT: Assistant Economic Planner Holly Howell, Interim Community Development Director Heather Richards

OTHERS PRESENT: Bill Schertzinger (Schertzinger & Party Architects), Shirlee Evans (North Canal Neighborhood Group), Trish Pinkerton (Redmond Spokesman)

(Scribe MD's Note: These minutes were created from an audio recording.)

CALL TO ORDER/INTRODUCTIONS

A quorum being present, Chair Dawson called the meeting to order at 5:08 PM.

DURAC CONSENT AGENDA

Approval of Minutes –

Mr. Allman made a motion to approve the December 8, 2008 and February 9, 2009 meeting minutes as presented; Mr. Streater seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS

Consideration of Frank and Josephine Redmond Linear Park Presentation –

Ms. Evans gave an overview of the park plan. The park was also on the DURAC agenda in April and May of 2008. Objection might be raised that it is a piece of land that is too small and too busy because it is close to the highway but there is no acquisition cost as it is all in easement to COID or ODOT. It creates an important off-street bicycle connection. Ms. Evans requested that DURAC make a recommendation to the Urban Renewal Agency for funding of just the trail portion to create a bicycle - pedestrian connection between the north and downtown. She already has an agreement with ODOT; her group is still working on an agreement with COID. There was a \$23,000 line item on the budget since last year, and this should be adequate for the trail. There was a question about whether action was taken last year. DURAC showed support but no official action was taken according to the minutes. There was a suggestion that it fits best under truck bypass project of Urban Renewal Plan. There was a question about what the \$23,000 covers. The contractor is from Bend and is willing to work with community volunteers.

Ms. Beale made a motion to recommend the linear park for funding not to exceed \$23,000 without additional approval to the Urban Renewal Agency; Mr. Allman seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Consideration of Awning Improvement Project Presentation –

Interim Community Development Director Heather Richards proposed an awning improvement project to enhance the appearance of downtown dramatically. She reported that trees would be removed and replaced with fewer trees to make the sidewalks less obstructed and allow for more outdoor café seating. Awnings would provide pedestrian protection and improve the appearance of the area with little cost. Awnings could be provided as a grant to the projects or at a low match level to encourage participation. The cash flow analysis shows \$481,000 left over in the property assistance program for the next 2 1/2 years. Ms. Richards proposed a recommendation to the Urban Renewal Agency to consider an awning improvement project to follow the 6th Street improvement project.

There was discussion to extend property assistance applications to income-producing property owners, and on the process for operating a selection and matching program to receive funding. It was recommended that the matching funds be reduced and offered on a first-come, first-served basis in order to encourage participation. Members agreed that the awnings would dress up the downtown area and create a more pedestrian friendly environment that would even attract new businesses. There was discussion that property owners should make some investment in the beautification, and suggested a \$500 match by property owner or business owner or a shared investment to make it feasible.

There was discussion about the value of street improvements in the surrounding areas of downtown without awnings, but it was recommended that the focus for improvements begin at the edge of the 6th Street project. Ms. Richards clarified that the property assistance program includes cosmetic changes to buildings as well based on approval by an executive design review committee. It was suggested that the defined project area start at the site of the demonstration project of 6th Street to stage as a model.

There was some discussion about whether to include a maximum as well a minimum cost. Concern was expressed that an establishment could take \$500 and then spend only a portion on the awning. Ms. Dawson pointed out that these concerns can be met by going through the two approved companies and making sure that the awnings have to go through the City's design review committee.

Mr. Boothroyd made a motion to recommend the continuation of the Downtown Awning Project. The property owner must invest a minimum of \$500 with a maximum subject to approval and with a 60-day timeframe after the 6th Street Project is complete. Awning designs must be approved by the design review committee; Mr. Streater seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

There was discussion on whether to have a third person on the design review committee. It was noted that Ms. Dawson volunteered.

URBAN RENEWAL PLAN DISCUSSION

Tenth Amendment to Urban Renewal Plan –

The ninth amendment representing Centennial Park and the Sixth Street project was brought to the last meeting. After legal review, Centennial Park was pulled out of it. Centennial Park was brought in as the tenth amendment. No motion was needed since it was already approved as part of the previous amendment. The Urban Renewal Agency will propose funding Centennial Park at more than the \$1 million that is in the plan right now. There is a need to look at other projects in the plan as they have reached the \$27.1 million overall for this plan. There are some projects in the plan that have not moved forward and the proposal was to drop those in order to fund Centennial Park. One of those was the street construction project put together in 1995 to pave some graveled streets that have since been paved under other programs. But another aspect of the street construction project involved putting sidewalks in those neighborhoods that were paved at a budgeted \$1.6 million. Staff felt that this amount was not sufficient to fund sidewalks and recommended deleting the project in order to cover the additional expenses of Centennial Park. Sidewalk projects can be funded by other programs in the future.

Questions were raised about the increased cost of Centennial Par from the \$1.3 million budgeted to the nearly \$4 million actual cost. This cost includes some utility work underground as well as property acquisition. Those are coming out of other projects in the plan. Staff pointed out that the actual buildout of the park is \$2.6 million and includes the public restrooms. In 1995, the park cost was estimated at \$1,013,000.

A cash flow analysis was presented. The \$2.5 million was already in the amended plan presented last year. Staff noted that there was \$3.6 million left to spend for Centennial Park this fiscal year with just over \$500,000 already spent.

Staff noted that they had come back to DURAC to request additional funds as the need to purchase property became apparent. But there was no amendment to the Urban Renewal Plan in the absence of a final cost accounting.

Staff gave a breakdown of the costs associated with Centennial Park: The overall cost is over \$4 million: \$900,000 is land acquisition; \$500,000 is for the Festival Street improvement; \$300,000 is for utility undergrounding; about \$2.2 million is for the actual park build-out. Staff proposed taking the money for sidewalks under the street construction project (\$1.6 million) and applying it in addition to the \$1 million allocated for Centennial Park buildout in 1995 to cover current cost of buildout (\$2.2 million) as well as Festival Street Improvements (\$500,000).

Questions were raised about where sidewalk construction funding will come from in the future. Staff reported that they are not sure and noted that city leaders have expressed the importance of this sidewalk construction. Local improvement districts would put the onus on property owners to fund it. It could also extend the downtown urban renewal district. Question was raised about not using sidewalk funds for the Centennial Park cost increase. Staff noted there is no other source. Discussion was raised on the extra costs, which includes \$500,000 for restrooms.

A question was raised about DURAC funding the full park cost. It was noted that there is some infrastructure costs associated with the plan. Discussion centered on whether fully funding Centennial Park is still a priority. Agreement was reached that park and open space is of overall benefit to the community versus something more localized like sidewalks. Staff pointed out that increased costs include greater cost for land acquisition (\$200,000 over five parcels), as well as \$300,000 for undergrounding utilities versus an originally budgeted \$50,000. Festival Street improvements came in at \$200,000 over original budget; the total increase was \$1 million.

Question was raised about having a corporate sponsor. Staff pointed out that reality is that having park completed by the Centennial means that project needs to be bid and awarded in two weeks time. This could happen after the bidding process is settled. Other sources of income in the future, such as kiosk leasing, will go into the Urban Renewal Project.

LIAISON COMMENTS

Mr. King discussed going through the bid process on the 6th Street project, specifically having a different evaluation process. Question was raised about who got the bid which could not be revealed yet.

CITIZEN COMMENTS

Mr. Shertzinger responded to a suggestion from DURAC and Ms. Richards to present a more complete proposal on "Playing in Traffic" project. He pointed out that many groups, like the Revenue Executive Association, think the project is a great idea. He pointed out that an educational group in Bend is also very enthusiastic, and they have a budget just short of \$500,000. Mr. Shertzinger reported that Traci Cooper saw no problem from a Fire Department perspective. He noted that everyone on City Council

seems supportive. Mr. Shertzinger conceded that there is still a lot of work to be done and that he will need funds to continue. He suggested \$15,000 for a 3D digital model to present to the community. He noted that he will be given a booth at the business expo to promote this project. Question was raised about changing the name. Mr. Shertzinger agreed that it could be changed.

Ms. Richards noted that there is \$100,000 budgeted for consultant fees, actually \$50,000 for REP, and \$50,000 for consultant staff.

There was discussion about what the \$15,000 would buy. Mr. Shertzinger responded that it would be a 3D digital model that "we could move around in" and would be presented to DURAC, the City Council, and the public in general. A digital form would be much easier to present and would not include commitments. He suggested that this could end up being a \$4 million project but expressed a willingness to put half of his architectural fee into it. He reported that general contractors are excited about the project and might be willing to donate half of their budgets. Ms. Richards pointed out that there are costs associated with marketing design not a real structural design. Question was raised about how easy it would be to alter the design to say add windows.

Mr. Allman asked what it would cost to go beyond marketing model to something that would yield firm figures. Mr. Shertzinger responded that for a \$4 million project, his fee would typically be 7% exclusive of structural engineering costs. Getting actual architectural figures is a big step forward but the concept piece could help. Mr. Shertzinger maintained that a concept piece is a necessary step to move forward not just a "fancy dog and pony piece." The 3D model can generate plans. Professional fees could be \$280,000 to \$300,000, usually divided into Concept design (15%), design development (15%), working drawings (45%), bidding (5%), and construction review (20%).

Mr. King raised the question of whether the 3D model was premature given uncertainty around the design such as questions around the number of floors, the carousel, etc. Mr. Shertzinger says the 3D model cost will include all but major structural changes. A question was raised about ODOT approval. Mr. Shertzinger said this was not formal yet, but they have expressed informal approval. Ms. Richards said this is a marketing design cost which is an important step in getting public dialogue to help finalize the design. Mr. Shertzinger pointed out that a 3D model allows viewing from different angles and perspectives. He expressed a desire to get a lot of community involvement although there are issues to sort out such as prevailing wage/union issues. Mr. Shertzinger said that he had presented the proposal to several community groups since coming before DURAC two weeks before. He will be going to Rotary and Kiwanis.

Question was raised about whether the \$339,000 '08/09 budget administrative fees had already been spent. Some of the leftover consulting line items will go to having an outside auditor come in to review Urban Renewal fees.

Mr. Shertzinger exited and discussion continued on the allocation. Positive community feedback was noted. Ms. Richards admits that usually such requests are more detailed, but this is a typical step. This could well put Redmond on the map and is a very unique piece. Ms. Nelson expressed opinion that it is a gamble but if they want to look for community support, DURAC would be the entity to support the project.

Mr. Allman made a motion to recommend funding \$15,000 for the "Playing in Traffic" project with the funding source to be determined by Ms. Richards; Mr. Boothroyd seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

STAFF COMMENTS (None)

ADJOURN

Chair Dawson adjourned the meeting at approximately 7:15 PM.

APPROVED BY THE DOWNTOWN URBAN RENEWAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND SIGNED BY
ME THIS 24th DAY OF July 2009.

ATTEST:

/s/ Margie Dawson
Margie Dawson, Chair

/s/ Heather Richards
Heather Richards,
Interim Community Development Director