



Home of the Tualatin River National Wildlife Refuge

City of Sherwood
SURPAC Meeting
(Sherwood Urban Renewal Plan Advisory Committee)
Civic Building - Executive Room
22560 SW Pine Street. Sherwood, OR 97140
Date: May 10, 2012 – 6:30pm

A G E N D A

- | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| 1. Call Meeting to Order | Chair Harbick |
| 2. Approval of Minutes
(3/01/12) | Chair Harbick |
| 3. Introductions for new members | |
| a. Handout of SURPAC formation resolutions | Chair Harbick |
| b. Future Training Items | Tom Pessemier |
| (Statement of Economic Interest Forms – Conflicts and Ethics) | |
| New Business | |
| 4. Selection of chair and co-chair for 2012 | Chair Harbick |
| Projects Updates | Tom Pessemier |
| a. Plaza (June 1 Celebration) | |
| b. Community Center | |
| c. Downtown Streets | |
| 5. URA Financial Reports | Tom Pessemier/Craig Gibons |
| 6. Future Project Information Sheets | Tom Pessemier/Bob Galati |
| 7. FY13 Project Recommendations | Craig Gibons/Tom Pessemier |
| 8. Next Meeting Date | Chair Harbick |
| Adjourn | |

Next meeting: SURPAC will be meeting, Thursday, June 14, 2012 at 6:30pm in the Executive Room at the City of Sherwood Civic Building.



SURPAC MEETING MINUTES

MEETING TITLE	SURPAC Meeting Notes
DATE & TIME	March 1, 2012 6:30 PM
LOCATION	Sherwood Civic Building – Conference Room A
FACILITATOR	Charles Harbick – SURPAC Chairman
NOTES TAKEN BY	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 21st 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 1st, 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.

**Urban Renewal Agency Financial Monitoring Report
As of March 31, 2012**

Chart 1

Total Maximum Indebtedness Expended	
MI Expended through January 2012*	\$ 33,195,402
MI Expended in February 2012	188,336
MI Expended in March 2012	<u>265,600</u>
Total MI Expended	\$ 33,649,338
<small>*see Ord 2012-005, E. Howard Report p. 2</small>	

Chart 2

Calculation of Uncommitted Maximum Indebtedness January 2012 (Ordinance 2012-005)	
Maximum Indebtedness (Ord 2012-005)	\$ 45,133,469
Project Expenditures as of Jan 31, 2012*	(33,195,402)
Adjust E. Howard Report for 8061 Expenses**	207,201
Committed Future Costs:	
8048 Cannery Site Development	181,274
8061 Community Center Building	5,056,612
8064 Cannery Plaza	747,212
8069 Columbia Street WQF	107,292
8060 Senior Housing	45,727
___ Cedar Creek Trail Design	-
8034 Downtown Streetscapes Ph 2	2,930,813
___ Downtown Alleys	-
Administrative Costs	<u>1,200,000</u>
Total Committed Project Budgets	<u>(10,268,930)</u>
Uncommitted MI	\$ 1,876,338
<small>* see Ord 2012-005, E. Howard Report p. 2</small>	
<small>** removes CC Bldg expenses through Jan 2012</small>	

**Urban Renewal Agency Financial Monitoring Report
As of March 31, 2012**

Chart 3

Committed Open Projects: Expenditures To Date, March 31, 2012					
Project	Budget	Expenses To- Date	Budget Remaining	Percent Completion	
8048 Cannery Site Development	\$ 3,373,222	\$ 3,213,230	\$ 159,992	95%	
8061 Community Center Building	5,056,612	440,985	4,615,627	9%	
8064 Cannery Plaza	2,749,259	2,146,554	602,705	78%	
8069 Columbia Street WQF	350,000	245,446	104,554	70%	
8060 Senior Housing	98,329	52,602	45,727	53%	
8034 Downtown Streetscapes Ph 2	2,931,028	215	2,930,813	0%	
____ Downtown Alleys	-	-	-	0%	
____ Cedar Creek Trail Design	-	-	-	0%	
Administrative Costs	1,200,000	51,626	1,148,374	4%	
	<u>\$ 15,758,450</u>	<u>\$ 6,150,656</u>	<u>\$ 9,607,794</u>		

Chart 4

Future Project List (Uncommitted Projects)*		
	Project Budget	Remaining MI
Uncommitted MI		\$ 1,876,338
Planned but Uncommitted Projects:		
Oregon Street Improvements	3,290,000	\$ (1,413,662)
Lincoln Street	734,000	\$ (2,147,662)
Century Drive Extension	500,000	\$ (2,647,662)
Cedar Creek Trail	500,000	\$ (3,147,662)
Property Acquisition	500,000	\$ (3,647,662)
Façade Grants	200,000	\$ (3,847,662)
Main Street Program	100,000	\$ (3,947,662)
Parking Study	50,000	\$ (3,997,662)
Sidewalk Improvements in Old Town	100,000	\$ (4,097,662)
Traffic Re-routing Study/Plans for Old Town	175,000	\$ (4,272,662)
Redevelopment of Public Land into Parking Lc	221,000	\$ (4,493,662)
* From Ordinance 2012-005, Exhibit A, Table 2		



22560 SW Pine Street
Sherwood, Oregon 97140
Ph: 503-625-5522
Fax: 503-625-5524
WebSite: www.sherwoodoregon.gov

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

To: Sherwood URA Board and SURPAC

From: Tom Pessemier, URA District Manager, City Manager Pro-Tem
Bob Galati, P.E., City Engineer

Date: May 10th, 2012

Topics: URA Proposed Project List Cost/Benefit Analysis

The following projects analysis summary is being presented to the Sherwood Urban Renewal Agency (URA) Board and URA Policy Advisory Committee (SURPAC) as directed by the URA Board. The intent of this summary is threefold: 1) to present a brief description of each of the projects listed on the URA Future Projects List; 2) a benefit/non-benefit analysis of each of the projects; and finally 3) a cost estimate for each of the projects.

This summary will provide information to the URA Board and SURPAC to help refine which projects the Board and SURPAC are willing to support allocation of funding of design and construction.

Cedar Creek Trail

URA Funding Allocation Requested: \$100,000

Project Description: The Cedar Creek Trail is an identified portion of the Tonquin Trail, a regional trail system that will provide multi-modal trail connection between the Willamette River and the Tualatin River Wildlife Refuge. This portion of the project is approximately 1.5 miles in length and runs from the Stella Olsen Memorial Park north and northeast through existing open space and vegetated corridor. In October 2009, a feasibility study was completed for the trail which identified the trail being comprised of three segments (A, B, & C). The feasibility study presented several trail cross-section options and possible alignments for each segment of the trail. Cost estimates were also provided for each trail segment, cross-section and alignment option.

Funding Analysis: In 2012 the City applied for and received a Regional Flexible Fund Grant of \$5.1 million dollars to design and construct the Cedar Creek Trail. This amount is split into approximately \$1.0 million for design and \$4.1 million for construction. A requirement of the grant is that the City is required to provide a match of 10% of the grant amount. For the design portion the City needs to provide \$100k to receive \$900K worth of grant funding. For the construction portion the City needs to provide \$400K to receive \$4.1 million. The \$100k funding request will be utilized within the 2012-13 fiscal year to develop the project plans, specifications, and coordinate the project bidding. The \$400k will be spent during the 2014-15 fiscal year for construction of the trail.

Project Benefit/Non-Benefit Analysis: The City has had this project listed in master planning documents for years. The project ranks very high in support locally and regionally as a benefit to the community and region. This project significantly promotes four of the five community goals established by the City Council. These four goals are Public Safety, Livability, Resident Well Being, and Economic Development. The major benefit to the community is the pedestrian connectivity provided by the trail. Residents of the City will be able to walk or ride their bicycles from their homes to the downtown core area without having to take surface streets or mingle with vehicular traffic. In addition the route that is being proposed provides close encounter with natural settings and can be used as an educational asset for the local school district. Homeowners who reside near the trail or abut the natural corridor could see an increased interest in home sales potential and price for these preferred properties.

There appear to be two potential drawbacks to the trail project based on homeowner perceptions. One perception is that homeowners would be losing their backyard privacy, and because of this loss of privacy, a reduction in their home and property value. The second perception is that homeowner personal and property safety would be compromised by having a trail so close to their property.

Recommendation: That SURPAC support allocation of \$100k for the design of the Cedar Creek Trail. This project has the potential of being a huge community asset and success.

Downtown Streetscape Phase 2

URA Funding Allocation Requested: \$2,930,813

Project Description: This project is the final phase of reconstructing the Old Town streets in the business area to a more pedestrian friendly standard. The first phase reconstructed Pine, 1st, and Main Streets in the Old Town business district to concrete streets with colored and patterned sidewalks and crosswalks. Included with this design was colored street lighting and pedestrian amenities. The Cannery phase constructed new streets on the south side of the railroad tracks to match aesthetically with the Phase 1 improvements. Phase 2 will finish the Old Town streets by reconstructing Railroad and Washington Streets to match the Cannery development standards.

Funding Analysis: Funding for this project has been divided into design and construction components. Funding approval for design has received approval and is in process. Construction funding is pending approval. The increase in maximum indebtedness has sufficient funds to cover the cost of this project in total.

Project Benefit/Non-Benefit Analysis: The benefits of this project are the completion of the Old Town streets within the business area. The new construction will benefit existing business by providing a better pedestrian corridor along building frontages and better roads which will draw more clients to Old Town.

Non-benefits may include foreseen but limited reduction of business impacts during construction. These non-benefit impacts may last up to 3 months, but with proper planning and design, minimized to maximum extent possible.

Recommendation: That SURPAC support allocation of \$2,930,813 for the design and construction of the Downtown Streetscapes Phase 2 project. This project has the potential of being a huge community asset and success.

Downtown Alleys

URA Funding Allocation Requested: \$500,000 (excludes storm drainage enhancements)

Project Description: The Downtown Alley project consists of rehabilitating nearly all the mid-block alleys located between Railroad Street and 3RD Street, from Ash Street to Park Street. All these mid-block alleys are classified as public right-of-way, similar to the rest of the streets in Sherwood. The majority of these alleys are where the public infrastructure (water, storm, and sewer) is located, and where many private franchise utilities (electric, telephone, cable, and gas) are also located. The use of most of these alleys has remained as vehicular access to residential parking and business access. A few of these alleys have been transformed into landscaped backyards and closed off to vehicular and pedestrian access of any type. Where the alleys are still open to vehicular traffic, the pavement sections are mostly gravel, with a few asphalt and concrete paved sections. The gravel sections tend to be rutted and potholed, and in poor condition.

The intent of this project is to rehabilitate the gravel public alleys to a minimum asphalt pavement standard section.

Funding Analysis: The total cost of this project is approximately \$500k. This amount excludes installation of storm drainage systems and assumes that the storm runoff will sheet flow onto adjacent private residence yards as is currently happening. To provide for collection of storm water runoff the projected construction cost would need to be increased by an additional \$250K.

Additionally, Alley Segments A and B are intended to be constructed as part of the Downtown Streetscapes Phase 2 project. As such, \$98k should be transferred from the Alleys project funding amount to the streetscapes project to cover the estimated cost. This would leave approximately \$400k to rehabilitate the rest of the alleys to a minimum pavement section.

Project Benefit/Non-Benefit Analysis: The main benefit to rehabilitating these publically owned alleys is that currently the City has to regularly maintain these gravel surfaced streets. By rehabilitating the pavement section, the annual maintenance issues are eliminated. The second benefit is that these rehabilitated alleys become effective pedestrian paths through the downtown core area. The third benefit is that there are several businesses located on these alleys, which would benefit from having paved access to the sites.

One drawback is that by paving these alleys, it makes access to the rear yards of residents more available. The second drawback is that by improving the alley pavement surface, the amount of cut-through traffic might increase, which again homeowners along alleyways may dislike.

Recommendation: That SURPAC support allocation of \$500k for the design and construction of the downtown alley improvements. This project has the potential of being a valuable community asset and would improve the downtown area significantly.

Oregon Street Improvements

URA Funding Allocation Requested: \$3.2 million

Project Description: This project reconstructs Oregon Street from the Lincoln Street intersection east to the Murdock Road roundabout. The extent of the improvements would include bringing the road section into compliance with the standard cross section for a 3-lane collector status road as defined by the City's TSP. Some right-of-way would need to be purchased from fronting properties. Utility upgrades to the storm and sanitary sewers systems would also be required, although the water system along Oregon Street appears to be adequately sized and good condition. Other overhead franchise utilities would be undergrounded.

Funding Analysis: The funding of some of the sidewalk improvements may come from the Cedar Creek Trail project as the multi-use trail alignment runs along the north side of Oregon Street. The City standard 5 foot wide sidewalk would be widened to 12-feet to meet the requirements of the trail project.

Additionally, if any development occurs on the north side of Oregon Street, frontage improvements to meet City standards would apply. The City could place a reimbursement district over the north side of Oregon Street to recover some of the construction costs.

Project Benefit/Non-Benefit Analysis: Oregon Street is one of the most heavily utilized streets running into and out of downtown Sherwood. As a major access road to Old Town Sherwood, the financial benefits to the businesses of Sherwood Old Town due to the improved conditions would be significant. And with the expected future development of the Tonquin Employment Area and the Tannery Site, Oregon Street would be the major connector between Downtown and the development area. Adjacent connecting streets and related properties may see an increase in property values because of the improved road section.

Recommendation: This project has a real impact on the future development of the Tonquin Employment Area and Tannery Site due to their direct connection to Old Town Sherwood. Staff recommends that SURPAC allocate any available funds towards this important development focused project.

Lincoln Street Rehabilitation, Willamette to Division Street

URA Funding Allocation Requested: \$734,000

Project Description: Lincoln Street is a City TSP collector status road running from Oregon Street to Division Street. The street was constructed to rural road standards and is significantly deficient to act as a collector status road in the City. The proposed project would not bring this road into full compliance with City standards, but would improve the road section to meet a minimal level of road performance. The suggested rehabilitation improvements include: removal of all of the existing asphalt pavement; cement treating the existing base rock section; and repaving with a standard asphalt section thickness. No other street improvements, such as installation of curb & gutter, sidewalks, street lights, or storm drainage systems, would be performed. The intent is to provide a minimum road surface that would have a life cycle of 10 to 15 years. This time would allow the City to develop funding to perform the full reconstruction of the road. The section of Lincoln Street from Oregon to Willamette Streets was rehabilitated in this fashion in 2011.

Funding Analysis: The cost to fully reconstruct Lincoln Street from Willamette Street to Division Street is approximately \$1.9 million. Adding the section of Lincoln Street between Oregon Street and Willamette Street may double the price to nearly \$3.8 million.

Project Benefit/Non-Benefit Analysis: Lincoln Street is a moderately used road which links the top of the hill and Snyder Park to with a direct route to Tualatin (Tualatin-Sherwood Road) and Wilsonville (Tonquin Road). Traffic volumes and speed are kept low because of the condition and limited width of the existing asphalt pavement surface.

Improvement of this road will be a benefit to residents of Sherwood who currently use it to commute to work outside the City. Non-residents who wish to visit Snyder Park would also see a direct benefit from this road improvement project. By performing rehabilitation rather than a full reconstruction, the City uses the funds to maximize the timeframe before a full reconstruction is required.

The non-benefits are that a full reconstruction would require purchasing right-of-way from properties fronting Lincoln Street. Many older homes were built closer to the road than current codes allow. The potential exists that many front yards would be severely impacted by the full road construction. Even rehabilitating the road requires a limited amount of right-of-way purchase to fit a minimum width road section. Again front yards may be impacted negatively.

The second most noticeable negative condition would be the increase of traffic use on Lincoln. Resident could expect to see increases in traffic volume and speed with either the rehabilitation or reconstruction of the road.

Another negative condition is that roadside storm drainage systems are inadequate. By rehabilitating the road section, storm water runoff would be increased with no identified way to mitigate it.

Recommendation: Rehabilitation of Lincoln Street has some good benefits to the residents and non-residents of Sherwood. Access to neighborhoods at the top of the hill and to Snyder Park would be improved. Overall local access to residences would be improved. Rehabilitation of Lincoln Street keeps the feel of the street near its current level while improving the performance of the road. And rehabilitation allows more time to develop funding strategies for full road reconstruction in the future.

Century Drive Extension

URA Funding Allocation Requested: \$500,000

Project Description: This funding allocation is in conformance with the development agreement the City entered into with Langer Development LLC. The intent of this funding allocation is to promote development by paying for the difference in construction cost between a parking lot and collector street. This portion of the development agreement was approved because the PUD for the project specifically excluded the construction of Century Drive. The Langer family did not want Century to go in at the time the PUD was adopted and the City agreed. At a later date the City changed to want the roadway but since the PUD was approved could not easily do so. This issue was looking like it would require litigation to resolve and may not have been resolved in the cities favor. This would also have delayed the project significantly. While the City agreed to pay for the difference to move the project forward the Langer's agreed to construct all of Langer Farms Parkway (Adams) from T-S to 99W which is a multi-million dollar project.

Funding Analysis: The City is obligated by the development agreement to provide the difference in the construction costs.

Project Benefit/Non-Benefit Analysis: The extension of Century Drive provides a final link between neighborhoods south of the existing Century Drive and businesses north of the existing Century Drive and Tualatin-Sherwood Road.

The sooner that the Langer property is developed will provide \$100's of thousands of dollars per year to the URA.

No non-benefit issues have been determined for local residents or businesses from the extension of Century Drive.

The URA has spent very little monies in this portion of the URA which has contributed a lot of monies to the URA.

Recommendation: The City is obligated to conform to the requirements of the development agreement and getting this project done sooner than later will benefit the URA. Therefore it is recommended that these monies are spent as soon as the developer is ready to develop.

Property Acquisitions

URA Funding Allocation Requested: \$260,000

Project Description: This funding allocation is based on URA objectives of finding available properties within the URA district boundary that may be redeveloped into higher/better use. The URA has already purchased properties within the district related to this URA primary objective. Future property purchase allocations include:

- The railroad property for future use as a parking lot associated with the Sherwood Community Center (\$241,725 Purchase Price).
- Future properties that would benefit the URA including properties that may be needed for parking or parking structures.

Funding Analysis: This funding allocation is one of the primary identified objectives of the Urban Renewal District. Each of the properties that has been acquired so far is being viewed as a long term asset to the City. The funding amount has been lowered by the amount of the Community Center purchase price.

Project Benefit/Non-Benefit Analysis: The overall benefit to the City is that properties acquired has the ability to be redeveloped into higher and better use. This will increase the value not only of these properties, but of the adjacent properties as well.

The non-benefit issue is one of timing. The benefits of properties can only be realized upon resale of the properties. The housing market has been severely hampered by the recent downturn of the economy, and hence may take a unknown amount of time to recover for the re-sale of already owned properties.

Recommendation: That SURPAC continue to take advantage of opportunities to purchase developable properties as these properties become available.

Facade Grants

URA Funding Allocation Requested: \$200,000

Project Description: This grant is intended to improve the appearance of existing buildings in order to enhance the overall aesthetics of Old Town Sherwood, to help in improving building safety and ADA accessibility, and to redevelop buildings and areas which are inconsistent with the goals and objectives of the URA.

Funding Analysis: The use of this fund by downtown businesses is well supported. The

Project Benefit/Non-Benefit Analysis: This program supports rehabilitating building facades in Old Town in order to promote business development in an area that reflects the small-town charm. As facades in the Old Town area are rehabilitated, the opportunities for newer businesses to succeed are increased. This benefits not only the Old Town area businesses but the residents of the City as well.

No non-benefit issues have been identified for this program.

Recommendation: That SURPAC continues to support this program funding.

DRAFT

Mainstreet Program

URA Funding Allocation Requested: \$100,000

Project Description: The Mainstreet Program promotes the Old Town area as the neighborhood's social, cultural, and economic center. This program organizes established and developing business owners and financial resources to sustain a long-term revitalization effort of the Old Town area.

Funding Analysis: This program is the reformatted Businesses of Old Town (BOOTS) organization. The program has moderate support from local businesses and has several projects that it is working on (i.e. way finding, Plaza bricks, etc.). The Mainstreet program supports development plans for Old Town based on a combination of funds from the local businesses and City allocations.

Project Benefit/Non-Benefit Analysis: This program is a solid benefit to the businesses of Old Town and the City as a whole.

Future support and involvement of the Old Town businesses is a vital component of the Mainstreet Program viability over time. Economic growth is necessary for this program to remain viable.

Recommendation: That SURPAC continue to support this program funding as funds are made available.

DRAFT

Parking Study

URA Funding Allocation Requested: \$50,000

Project Description: This project will perform a full parking study of the downtown area and small parts of adjacent residential neighborhoods to identify current parking availability and usage, and determine long term parking availability based on growth projections.

Funding Analysis: Currently available parking within the Old Town and Cannery area appears to be sufficient. However, as future (re)development occurs in the downtown area, it can be expected that competition between residents, business patrons and clients, and business staff for parking will exceed the current parking availability. The cost of a parking study is estimated to run between \$30,000 and \$50,000.

Project Benefit/Non-Benefit Analysis: This project has direct impacts to the future of businesses of Old Town, both for existing and future. Development could be severely stymied if adequate number and appropriately located parking spaces are not identified or developed.

Recommendation: That SURPAC continue to support this program funding as funds are made available.

DRAFT

Sidewalk Improvements in Old Town

URA Funding Allocation Requested: \$100,000

Project Description: The streets located throughout downtown Sherwood have varying degrees of sidewalks, from new 5-foot wide sidewalk with planter strip, to narrower 4-foot wide curbtight sidewalk, to no sidewalk at all. Many sections of the oldest sidewalks are in poor condition and need to be replaced.

Funding Analysis: City staff has performed a preliminary sidewalk survey to identify the extent of substandard sidewalks and the estimated probable cost to replace. This funding amount would remedy the majority of the sidewalk issues found in downtown, exclusive of those cases where any easements or right-of-way would need to be acquired to make any public improvements.

Project Benefit/Non-Benefit Analysis: The benefits to the downtown area are significant. Residents and business owners would benefit greatly from the ability of pedestrians to walk to destinations of interest.

There are no identified non-benefit issues from supporting this program.

Recommendation: That SURPAC continue to support this program funding as funds are made available.

DRAFT

Traffic Re-Routing Study/Plans for Old Town

URA Funding Allocation Requested: \$175,000

Project Description: This project works in conjunction with 1st and 2nd Streets east of Pine becoming one way couplets. Both of these street segments will become couplets by the time when the Cannery site is fully developed. Traffic routing west of Pine will need to adjust to the change in traffic flow patterns. A full traffic routing study will need to be performed to determine what changes should be undertaken, and what the impacts of these changes may be on local businesses and residents.

Funding Analysis: This project is extensive and would include a significant amount of public input and approval for any adopted plan.

Project Benefit/Non-Benefit Analysis: The main benefit of this project is that the final traffic routing plan would have a clear understanding of the future growth impacts of the downtown area on traffic flow within the downtown area. The ability to mitigate traffic issues early in any approval process is preferable.

The major drawback to changing the downtown traffic pattern is the perceived impacts to businesses and residents. Traffic flow may be required to be routed along non-business frontage streets to provide the best route through town. The increase in traffic flow may be severe to local homeowners.

Recommendation: SURPAC should support this program funding as a future project.

Redevelopment of Public Lands into Parking Lots

URA Funding Allocation Requested: \$371,000

Project Description: This project continues to review potential sites and allocate funds as necessary to help sustain the parking availability level within the URA District area. A portion of these monies will go towards the construction of the Community Center Parking areas and will reduce the allocation requested.

Funding Analysis: The funding request is based on projected parking needs within the URA District limits. These needs are not fully understood and will not be until a long term parking analysis is completed.

Project Benefit/Non-Benefit Analysis: This project benefits businesses and adjacent URA District neighborhoods. It promotes parking in areas which have the least impact on residential areas, and provides opportunities for parking lots based on future business development.

Non-benefit of this project is that development of purchased land may take a significant amount of time to occur. The tax reversal on the removal of the lot from the taxable lots is not a priority of the City.

Recommendation: Continue to support the funding of this work only if business development warrants it.

DRAFT

SURPAC Meeting Date: May 10, 2012

Agenda Item: Proposed Projects

ACTION ITEM

TO: SURPAC
FROM: Tom Pessemier, Agency Director
SUBJECT: **FY13 Proposed Projects**

ISSUE:

This memo identifies two projects for the Committee's consideration for inclusion in the project list for FY13, the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2012.

ACTION REQUESTED:

Addition of the two projects to the Agency's FY13 project list: Cedar Creek Trail Design and Downtown Alley Rehabilitation.

BACKGROUND:

During the FY13 budget process, staff identified two projects that should be added to the Agency's committed projects list and undertaken in FY13

The first project is the design of the Cedar Creek Trail. The City received a \$5 million grant from the County to design and build most of the Cedar Creek Trail. The grant has a 10%, or \$500,000, match requirement. The FY13 portion of the project is the trail design and the City's match is \$100,000. Staff has identified the URA as the preferred source for this funding.

The second project is the design and construction of downtown alleys. The Committee has indicated that this is a priority. Staff will provide a project description and cost at the meeting on Thursday.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that the Committee submit the addition of the Cedar Creek Trail Design and the Downtown Alley Rehabilitation to the Agency Board of Directors for inclusion on the committed list of Agency projects.