



# SURPAC MEETING MINUTES

<b>MEETING TITLE</b>	SURPAC Meeting Notes
<b>DATE &amp; TIME</b>	March 1, 2012 6:30 PM
<b>LOCATION</b>	Sherwood Civic Building – Conference Room A
<b>FACILITATOR</b>	Charles Harbick – SURPAC Chairman
<b>NOTES TAKEN BY</b>	Tom Nelson

## ATTENDEES

**Name of Board or Group**

Tim Heine  
 Charles Harbick - Chair  
 Vacant  
 Bob Silverforb  
 Mark Cottle  
 Ken Marlow  
 Scott Johnson – Vice Chair

**City Staff**

Tom Nelson

**Others In Attendance**

Lee Weislogel – Sherwood Main Street  
 Bob Galati – City Engineer  
 Tom Pessemier – City Manager Pro Tem

**Council Liaison**

Matt Langer

## MEETING NOTES

**Approved:** \_\_\_\_\_

1. The meeting was called to order at 6:31pm by Chair Harbick
2. Mr. Silverforb moved, and Mr. Harbick seconded the motion to approve minutes from the 12/1/11 and 2/15/12 meetings. The motion passed 6-0.
3. **Paver Project** – Mr. Weislogel update the committee on the paver project. He said that Sherwood Main Street had been in discussion with URA Chair Mays and City Manager Pro Tem, Tom Pessemier, and that details were being negotiated, and that a vote for approval was hoped for in March.
4. **Substantial Amendment Update** – Mr. Nelson showed a MS PowerPoint presentation that had been viewed by the Sherwood City Council at its February 21<sup>st</sup> meeting, detailing the success of the Urban Renewal Agency to date, and demonstrating why the increase in maximum indebtedness was needed, and why the council voted for approval. Mr. Cottle said he would like to see an accounting of the money spent to date on urban renewal. Mr. Nelson showed the committee a report that detailed where money had been spent. Mr. Nelson said that all projects had been within budget, and approved by the URA Board, but that the tracking of Maximum

Indebtedness had been difficult due to the fact that it changes, and that there is no accounting system in place to track it.

Mr. Cottle expressed that he wanted a better accounting of this in the future, and Mr. Pessemier indicated that he had directed Finance to develop reports on a monthly basis that would better account for project costs going forward. Mr. Langer said that the Council wants SURPAC's input and that they all needed to be on the same page.

5. **SURPAC Role discussion** – Mr. Harbick said there had been some discussion of the actual role of SURPAC. Mr. Nelson distributed the original URA resolution that created SURPAC that indicated it was to advise the URA on development of the Urban Renewal Plan and the Old Town Master Plan. Mr. Cottle and Mr. Weislogel indicated that subsequent resolutions further defined SURPACs make-up and role. They agreed that advising the URA and staff on economic development was also part of their role. Mr. Nelson said he would look into it, and Mr. Weislogel said he had copies and would send them to Mr. Nelson. Mr. Heine questioned information that was on the website, and Mr. Nelson said that it appeared to be in error, and that he would investigate and update it.

## 6. Projects Update

- a. **Plaza** – Mr. Nelson reported that the Plaza was substantially complete, and that it and the Streets/Infrastructure project had been completed with close to \$600,000 under budget.
  - b. **Community Center** – Mr. Nelson reported that Capstone Partners, Ankrom Moisan Architects, and R&H Construction (CM/GC general contractor) had been meeting with him, Bill Butterfield, and various potential subcontractors to narrow and detail the scope, and attempt to bring the project into the proposed \$2.5 million construction budget specified in the URA Resolution. He said it was difficult due to the fact that staff and Capstone, along with construction estimators had originally estimated closer to \$2.9 million before adoption of the resolution by the URA Board. He said that additional detail pertaining to structural needs due to the brick requirement, as well as detail added by the theater and sound consultants had driven the most recent estimate to closer to \$3 million. He reported that the amount listed in the maximum indebtedness report accounted for the larger estimate. He reported that staff hoped to have a final recommendation to the URA Board in March.
  - c. **Downtown Streets** – Mr. Nelson reported that the City had received responses to a RFP to prequalify a design firm, and Mr. Galati reported that the plan was to complete redevelopment of the alley between SW Pine and SW Main and SW Railroad and SW 1<sup>st</sup>, prior to work on the streets to allow for better business access during construction. He said that the plan was to have construction completed this calendar year.
7. **Project Priorities Discussion** – Mr. Pessemier asked the committee to review the detailed handout which described proposed projects. He asked if the committee wanted to go through the list project by project. Mr. Harbick indicated that he should do that. Mr. Cottle questioned that \$1.9 million item for Cannery completion at the top of the list, and Mr. Nelson explained that it was the balance of projected need to complete the Cannery Project, including the Sherwood Community Center. Mr. Galati and Mr. Pessemier continued to describe the projects on the list. Some of the committee questioned the priority for redevelopment of SW Oregon Street. Mr. Pessemier explained that part of it would be improvement for Cedar Creek Trail, and that it would be unlikely to find funding for the project elsewhere. He also provided some detailed description of the Cedar Creek Trail project and the funding that will mostly come from other sources. Mr. Pessemier offered to develop briefing papers which provide more detail and

indicate the pros and cons for each project. The committee agreed that was a good idea. Mr. Pessemier and Mr. Langer also offered that the list was open to additional projects. Mr. Harbick stated that Administration was also a priority since the URA needed someone to continue to implement the plan and focus on economic development.

Mr. Pessemier indicated that the Century Drive project was necessary due to the development agreement the City had for the Langer PUD. The committee questioned the need for a parking study and the amount listed. Mr. Cottle said that he thought it would cost quite a bit more and Mr. Pessemier agreed. Mr. Nelson stated that the \$50,000 figure was derived from a 2009 quote for \$42,000 to do a parking study. The committee suggested that the Traffic Rerouting Study and Parking Study be rolled into one project.

After considerable discussion it was determined that SURPAC wanted more input from the community on most of the projects. The committee discussed getting input from others through the Archer, and/or through a Chamber Forum. Mr. Pessemier asked if they would like to have an Open House for the community, but consensus was that a Chamber Forum would attract the best audience. Mr. Harbick cautioned that the list already included more projects than available funding would allow. Mr. Nelson indicated that eventually all projects could be completed when property was sold for development. However, consensus was that the Alleys, Downtown Streets, and completion of the Cannery project were top priorities. Mr. Cottle moved and Mr. Heine seconded the motion to recommend them as top priorities to the URA Board, and that those projects be expedited. The motion passed 5-0 (Mr. Marlow had left earlier.)

**8. Adjourn** – The meeting was adjourned at 8:20 pm.