

**SHERWOOD URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY BOARD OF DIRECTORS
MEETING MINUTES**

Tuesday, December 17, 2024

**City of Sherwood City Hall
22560 SW Pine Street
Sherwood, Oregon 97140**

URA BOARD MEETING

- 1. CALL TO ORDER:** Chair Tim Rosener called the meeting to order at 7:28 pm.
- 2. BOARD PRESENT:** Chair Tim Rosener, Vice Chair Kim Young, Board Members Taylor Giles, Renee Brouse, Doug Scott, Keith Mays, and Dan Standke.
- 3. STAFF AND LEGAL COUNSEL PRESENT:** City Manager Craig Sheldon, Assistant City Manager Kristen Switzer, Interim City Attorney Sebastian Tapia, Interim Public Works Director Rich Sattler, IT Director Brad Crawford, Police Chief Ty Hanlon, City Engineer Jason Waters, Finance Director David Bodway, and Agency Recorder Sylvia Murphy.

4. CONSENT AGENDA:

A. Approval of October 15, 2024 URA Board Meeting Minutes

MOTION: FROM VICE CHAIR YOUNG TO APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA. SECONDED BY BOARD MEMBER BROUSE. MOTION PASSED 7:0. ALL MEMBERS VOTED IN FAVOR.

Chair Rosener addressed the next agenda item.

5. CITIZEN COMMENTS:

There were no citizen comments and Chair Rosener addressed the next agenda item.

6. NEW BUSINESS:

A. URA Resolution 2024-006, Authorizing the URA Agency Manager to Approve Additional Art Infrastructure on the Hwy 99W Pedestrian Bridge Project

City Engineer Jason Waters introduced KPFF consultant Nick Halsey and stated that the proposed resolution would establish an art budget for the pedestrian bridge project. Mr. Waters presented the "Sherwood Hwy. 99W Pedestrian Crossing" (see record, Exhibit A) and reported that the Cultural Arts Commission, city staff, and the consultant recommended Option B. City Manager Craig Sheldon clarified that staff was still working with the contractor on finalizing the pricing and explained that unless the Board chose the highest dollar amount, the resolution would need to be amended. He stated that the recommended option would still provide good quality lights. KPFF consultant Nick Halsey stated that there were four options for the Board to choose from and explained that the timing of getting an artist on board was late for the overall process. He explained that they had just enough time to include it in the

contractor's scope so the art would be completed with the bridge. He stated that a decision must be made quickly in order to release the contractor to proceed and not impact the project schedule. Mr. Halsey stated that choosing one of the four options would allow the contractor to maintain the project schedule, and choosing an option outside of those outlined would delay work on the project. He provided an overview of the pedestrian bridge site location and reported that the bridge was designed to include architectural lighting, medallions within the deck of the bridge, and an art feature wall at the east approach. He clarified that the art feature wall at the east approach was the area that they would be discussing at this meeting. Mr. Halsey outlined the four art budget options and explained all the options included the overall bridge lighting design and implementation, artist fee, and east wall concrete relief work. He addressed Option B and Option C and stated they included an east wall laser cut screen which was an additional art opportunity the artist had proposed after they began working with the Cultural Arts Commission and Council. He expressed that the east wall laser cut screen would make a much taller, more visually impactful statement and would do a good job of tying the art piece into the overall broader vision of the bridge's art. He stated Option C also included upgraded lighting for the east wall and explained that the design team had expressed enthusiasm for the upgraded lighting but had deemed the estimated cost to be prohibitive. He noted that the artist recommended not using colored lighting for the east wall as it would detract from the artwork and distract from the bridge span lighting. Mr. Halsey addressed Option D and explained that it included the upgraded lighting for the east wall but removed the east wall laser cut screen. He noted that the design team and Cultural Arts Commission recommended prioritizing the east wall laser cut screen over the upgraded lighting for the east wall and recommended moving forward with Option B or Option A. He provided an overview of the east wall views. Mr. Halsey clarified that lighting would still be included for the east wall if Option B was chosen. Vice Chair Young asked if the laser cut screen was not included, what would be included for the east wall and Mr. Halsey replied that it would be the typical project railing for part of the length of the wall. Vice Chair Young asked if the wall and the fence were a part of the original contract. Mr. Halsey replied that the railing was included in the original contract and the city would receive a credit back. Vice Chair Young asked if the laser cut screen cost \$160,000 and Mr. Halsey clarified that including the credit back, the laser cut screen would cost more than \$160,000. He explained that the credit was worth less at this point because they had already started procuring much of the material, so the cost savings came from the labor. He noted that because the bridge utilized the same railing design throughout, the already purchased materials could be saved for future maintenance use. He commented that he estimated the credit to amount to roughly \$20,000 in savings. Board Member Giles asked if the concrete wall would have the relief patterning no matter the option the Board picked, and Mr. Halsey replied that was correct. He explained that the original bid stated the contractor would receive a custom form liner from the city, and the chosen artist recommended the procurement of the form liner to the contractor's scope. Board Member Scott asked for more information on the programming for the lights for the bridge span. Mr. Halsey explained that the artist for the east wall design would also assist in selecting 20 different lighting patterns for the bridge. Board Member Scott asked how the number 20 was chosen and Mr. Halsey replied that 20 was chosen as an arbitrary number for the bid. Board Member Scott commented that he wanted the city to be able to control and decide future lighting patterns. Mr. Halsey replied that the system had the ability to do that, but it was a very technical process to program the patterns in. Board Member Scott asked how much it would cost to add a new lighting pattern and Mr. Halsey replied, "a lot." Board Member Scott commented that it felt like the city was buying the wrong software. Board Member Scott asked how it was decided that the artist would choose the lighting design and Mr. Halsey explained the artist would work with the Cultural Arts Commission and the city on choosing the 20 designs. Board Member Scott stated he wanted Council to have the final decision on what the final 20 lighting designs were. Chair Rosener asked how much the city was being charged to design lighting options. Assistant

City Manager Kristen Switzer replied that that portion of the contract had not been completed with the artist as of yet. She explained that the artist was available to help choose lighting designs with the thought that the Cultural Arts Commission and Council would pick themes, and the artist would then make lighting designs based on those themes. Chair Rosener asked what the anticipated cost was for that work and Mr. Halsey replied that it was a subset of the allowances presented at this meeting. Chair Rosener suggested that a basic "on" theme be determined and more themes could be created at a later date in order to better understand the costs for lighting design themes. Mr. Halsey clarified that the city had already paid the programming cost for those 20 designs, which was likely a bigger expense than the artist's help designing the themes. Chair Rosener asked how much the 20 designs cost. Mr. Halsey explained that he did not have a cost breakout for the designs, but the total amount for the bridge's lighting was \$3.3 million which included architectural fixtures and pathway lighting. Chair Rosener asked that the breakout cost be shared with the Board. Discussion occurred and City Manager Sheldon reported that the artist's contract was for \$77,000 and did not include help with lighting design. Vice Chair Young clarified that the figures cited in the options presented to the Board at this meeting did not include the cost for the artist to assist in lighting design and Assistant City Manager Switzer replied that was correct. Vice Chair Young referred to the 20 lighting designs cited in the contractor's contract and asked who, if not the artist, would design those 20 designs. Mr. Halsey replied that it would fall to city staff or the Cultural Arts Commission. Vice Chair Young stated she wanted to know what the artist would charge to create those 20 designs and then let the Board decide on whether to proceed or not. Ms. Switzer replied that she would get that information to the Board. She explained that staff did not have enough information available when they were drafting the contract and trying to get the artist on board and commented that it was likely that an amendment would be needed at a later date. Chair Rosener clarified that the Board needed to choose an option at this meeting, and they could discuss the lighting proposal at a future meeting. Ms. Switzer replied that they had broken it out into different parts so they could utilize the artist only when they wanted to. Board Member Scott stated that he wanted the Board to be the final decision maker for the 20 lighting designs and Chair Rosener and Vice Chair Young stated that they agreed. Mr. Halsey explained that it was presumed that each option he presented would also cover the lighting design choices. He stated that the lighting design process needed to be started soon if the project was to remain on schedule. The Board asked why the lighting design process needed to be started so early and Mr. Halsey explained the lights needed to be installed before the railing system and referred to the contractor's substantial completion. Board Member Scott asked regarding the "Sherwood" design they had discussed at a previous meeting. Board Member Mays explained that that area was a part of the ODOT right-of-way, and ODOT had to approve the sign, which would likely take 18-months. Vice Chair Young asked for clarification on the cost of the 20 lighting designs versus the cost of the artist to assist in designing the lighting scenes. Board Member Scott explained that the cost for programming the 20 designs was included in the options they were shown at this meeting, but the cost for having the artist assist in creating those designs was not and discussion occurred. Mr. Halsey reported that the concrete relief pattern cost roughly \$70,000, the artist fees cost roughly \$77,000 for the first piece, and the remaining \$53,000 included the allowance for the medallions in the bridge deck and the lighting color designs. Chair Rosener asked how much the bridge medallions were and Mr. Halsey replied they did not know yet. Board Member Scott commented that the more they spent on lighting design, the less they would have for medallions and Mr. Halsey replied that was correct. City Manager Sheldon commented that the details were still being worked out and asked that the Board choose an option to set an allowance so staff could finish negotiations with the contract. Chair Rosener commented that he felt that was fine, but he was worried about cost variations between the vendors and asked that staff get cost breakdowns from the vendors to help the Board understand. Mr. Halsey reported that they did have a detailed cost breakdown from the contractor and outlined that the pieces not going through the contractor included the

artist, lighting, color design, and medallions. Chair Rosener asked for Board feedback on the proposed options. Board Member Scott stated that he liked Option B, but he wanted to wait on the additional lighting design component. He stated he wanted to pay for the medallions, screen wall, concrete relief, and the base artist fee but he wanted more information on what it would cost for the artist to assist in creating lighting designs before proceeding. He stated he was fine with the total budget, but wanted staff to come back when they had more information so the Board could decide how to spend the remaining funds. Assistant City Manager Switzer stated that before selecting someone to design the lighting, staff could provide more information to the Board to provide feedback on. She stated that if the Board decided that that was the route they wanted to go, staff would work on finding an artist or designer to do that work. She stated that if the Board felt comfortable approving Option B, staff could receive more firm pricing on the medallions before a selection was made. Board Member Scott asked how many medallions they estimated were needed, and Mr. Hasley replied that there would be eight medallions. Board Member Brouse asked how comfortable they were with the allowance in the budget, and did he feel confident that they would stay within the \$360,000. Mr. Halsey referred to the pieces that were in the contractor scope and stated that they had change order pricing that would be updated after a decision was made at this meeting. He explained that this would allow staff to finalize the changes and begin procurement. He commented that the contractor pieces were not likely to change by much. Board Member Giles referred to the positioning of the wall and the potential "Sherwood" sign in front of it and stated that those things made the piece feel more like a background piece than featured artwork. He stated that he was in favor of a plainer design because it would be mostly hidden by the artwork in front of it. Board Member Mays commented that there was no assurance that the city would be allowed to put anything in front of the sign because of ODOT. Mr. Halsey added that ODOT had been clear to date that they did not see a path to putting "Sherwood letters there." Board Member Giles asked if the "Sherwood" signage could go above the wall in lieu of the laser cut screen and Board Member Scott replied that presented the same problem for ODOT. Board Member Scott commented that he agreed with Board Member Giles that the piece in question was mostly in the background. Board Member Giles commented that because of that, he would rather spend the money elsewhere. Board Member Brouse stated she was inclined toward Option B. Vice Chair Young stated that she was in favor of the laser cut screen and said she was in favor of Option B. Board Member Mays stated he was in favor of Option B and said that Option B was what the Cultural Arts Commission supported. Board Member Scott stated he supported Option B with the caveat that the city did not move forward with paying someone for lighting design at this time. Board Member Standke asked if the resolution could be amended to remove the \$53,000. Board Member Scott commented that the \$53,000 also covered the medallions and Board Member Standke replied that was true, but it would cover all of the items the Board was sure of at this meeting. Board Member Scott commented that the contractor needed to know regarding the medallions as soon as possible. City Manager Sheldon explained that if the city did not use the artist for the design work, and somebody else was brought in, a budget still needed to be established for "the art deal" because this piece needed to move very quickly to keep the project on track. He continued that lighting needed to be figured out by January and explained that ODOT would have a say in what kind of lighting the city could use. He stated that the city needed to stay on track in order to avoid change orders and delays. Vice Chair Young commented that she felt that staff understood the Board's concerns, so if the Board approved the full budget staff knew they needed to come back before contracts moved forward. Chair Rosener commented that he agreed and stated he agreed that the area in question was more background, and he would choose Option A. The Board discussed the site without the laser cut screen. Vice Chair Young asked where the extra funds were coming from and Mr. Sheldon replied that the money was coming from the URA funds brought in by additional property taxes. He reported that the URA was doing better than predicted by about \$400,000 this year. Vice Chair Young began the language to make a motion, Board Member Mays interjected, the

City Recorder provided clarification on the motion-making process, and the Interim City Attorney provided suggested wording for the motion to Vice Chair Young.

MOTION: FROM VICE CHAIR YOUNG TO AMEND URA RESOLUTION 2024-006 BY REPLACING \$450,000 WITH \$200,000 AND REPLACING \$45,000 WITH \$20,000 THROUGHOUT THE RESOLUTION. SECONDED BY BOARD MEMBER BROUSE. MOTION PASSED 5:2; CHAIR ROSENER, VICE CHAIR YOUNG, BOARD MEMBER BROUSE, BOARD MEMBER GILES, AND BOARD MEMBER SCOTT VOTED IN FAVOR. BOARD MEMBER MAYS AND BOARD MEMBER STANDKE OPPOSED.

MOTION: FROM VICE CHAIR YOUNG TO APPROVE URA RESOLUTION 2024-006 AS AMENDED. SECONDED BY BOARD MEMBER SCOTT. MOTION PASSED 5:2; CHAIR ROSENER, VICE CHAIR YOUNG, BOARD MEMBER BROUSE, BOARD MEMBER GILES, AND BOARD MEMBER SCOTT VOTED IN FAVOR. BOARD MEMBER MAYS AND BOARD MEMBER STANDKE OPPOSED.

7. ADJOURN

Chair Rosener adjourned the meeting at 8:15 pm.

Attest:


Sylvia Murphy, MMC, Agency Recorder


Tim Rosener, Chair