



Ad Hoc Urban Renewal Citizens Advisory Committee

March 22, 2021 – 5:30 PM

Newberg City Hall

414 E First Street (teleconference meeting)

<https://zoom.us/j/99715430392>

Or join by phone:

Dial(for higher quality, dial a number based on your current location):

US: +1 669 900 6833 or +1 253 215 8782 or +1 346 248 7799 or +1 929 205 6099 or +1

301 715 8592 or +1 312 626 6799

Webinar ID: 997 1543 0392

Email any comments to doug.rux@newbergoregon.gov

I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER

II. ROLL CALL

III. CONSENT CALENDAR

- A. Ad Hoc Urban Renewal Citizens Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes
February 22, 2021 and March 8, 2021

IV. NEW BUSINESS

- A. Preliminary Draft Sections of Urban Renewal Plan & Report

V. PUBLIC COMMENTS

(5-minute maximum per person - for items not on the agenda)

VI. ITEMS FROM STAFF

VII. ITEMS FROM COMMITTEE MEMBERS

VIII. Next Meeting

May 24, 2021

IX. ADJOURNMENT

ACCOMMODATION OF PHYSICAL IMPAIRMENTS:

In order to accommodate persons with physical impairments, please notify the Community Development Department Office Assistant II of any special physical or language accommodations you may need as far in advance of the meeting as possible and no later than 48 business hours prior to the meeting. To request these arrangements, please contact the Office Assistant at (503) 537-1240. For TTY services please dial 711.

AD HOC URBAN RENEWAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Meeting Minutes

February 22, 2021 6:00 PM

NEWBERG CITY HALL

Meeting held electronically due to COVID-19 pandemic

(This is for historical purposes as meetings are permanent retention documents and this will mark this period in our collective history)

Chair John Bridges the called meeting to order at 5:32 pm

ROLL CALL

Members Present: John Bridges, Chair
Francisco Stoller, Vice Chair
Stephanie Findley
Molly Olson
Don Clements
Joe Morelock, arrived late
Cassandra Ulven
Loni Parrish

Members Absent: Rick Rogers, excused
Angel Agular
Josh Duder

Staff Present: Doug Rux, Community Development Director
Brett Musick, Senior Engineer
Shannon Buckmaster, Economic Health Manager

CONSENT CALENDAR:

Approval of the January 25, 2021 Ad Hoc Urban Renewal Citizens Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes

MOTION: Member Olson and Member Ulven moved to approve the January 25, 2021 Ad Hoc Urban Renewal Citizens Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes, Motion carried 7/0

NEW BUSINESS:

Chair Bridges noted the two things that need to be accomplished is to finalize the projects that they have in the plan and to identify the rate that should go into the plan, keeping in mind they are just making recommendations.

Outline of Urban Renewal Plan and Report

Elaine noted the table of contents included in the packet is the outline of every Urban Renewal Plan and report that they do because they follow what is required in State Statute. She noted she highlighted the portions of an Urban Renewal Plan and Report that are specific to an Urban Renewal Area. When they look at the table of contents for the plan the things that are specific to Newberg are an introduction of the process and what they went through to get the plan prepared. The identification of what the maximum indebtedness is, the plan goals, the Urban Renewal project categories, the Urban Renewal projects, and amendments to the plan section which is usually the same in every locality, unless there is something particular they are concerned about that they want a higher level of review than just a minor amendment. This section can change if needed, if the committee has some specific concern. The other sections include property acquisition, relocation methods, tax increment financing of plan, validity, and annual report which is the same in every Urban Renewal Plan with some legislative language that needs to be there. The section on relationship to local objectives is a large section that doesn't mean anything to anyone except if you're a City Planner. It is a portion of the Urban Renewal

Plan that conforms to the other plans that the City has. It doesn't help on implementation or deciding of the projects, it just ties the fact that what you're doing is supported by the other planning documents. Finally in the table of contents is the legal description for the plan.

Chair Bridges asked when is the draft of the Urban Renewal Plan going to be ready for them to review.

Elaine noted it would be about a month after the Committee decides the projects.

CDD Rux noted the Committee will come up with their project list and the preliminary draft of the Urban Renewal Plan and Report will be done latter part of March. There will be a Community Open House in April, then the Committee will meet again in the latter part of May with a final plan and report.

Chair Bridges noted in this document, as a Committee, he recommends they choose to have a termination date of 30 years and to do the early proportionate sharing with agencies of funding in the plan document as well.

Elaine noted that is correct, those two provisions would go under the tax increment financing of the plan and if the Committee wanted to add something about that in the amendments to the plan section it could be done. You will want to put in a duration in the amendment section because you wouldn't want the duration changed to a minor amendment, it is a resolution.

Elaine continued and noted the Plan is the document that gets adopted by the City Council and the Report is also required by ORS 457, but it's not actually adopted by the City Council, it is just the document that supports everything done in the plan. This is the document they get the findings of blight and the document that shows financial feasibility and defines all of the projects and existing conditions of the projects. Everything in the Report is specific to the Urban Renewal Area except the relocation report, which can be specific if you're acquiring a certain piece of property and can identify that property up front and comply with all required laws. She noted everything in the report analysis is required by the Statute and is specific to Newberg. What is unchangeable in the Urban Renewal Plan is the maximum indebtedness. It is changeable through an amendment, but it has to go through a whole process of adding property over 1% of the existing area. Everything put into the report helps comply with all the statutory restrictions. For example a financing plan that shows how these projects could be funded over time. The financing plan can be changed every year as conditions change. It says the plan is feasible at the point of adoption, but it isn't locked into funding projects in that specific time frame. The things that are most difficult to change is the substantial amendment if you increase the acreage by more than 1%.

Chair Bridges asked CDD Rux to go over what the project costs are now and what the different levels of growth rate generate.

CDD Rux noted the list started at \$117 million dollars and the one in the meeting packet is based on the priority of projects from the last meeting is at \$87 million dollars. The 4% growth rate would mean that the projects in 2020 dollar values of \$27.9 million dollars, at 5% growth rate it is \$39.4 million dollars, at 6% growth rate it is at \$53.7 million dollars, and at 7% growth rate it is at \$71.1 million dollars. He noted there were some discussions at the last meeting about a 6.5% growth rate, so he had Nick run those numbers. The 6.5% growth rate 2020 capacity is \$61.9 million dollars.

Chair Bridges noted with these other funding sources, SDCs, grants and developer funding agreements, is it reasonable to set the project list at more than what the plan will generate, even if we meet the assumed growth rate. He asked if there's a standardized approach, for example set it at 118% of the budget because there's other contributions over the life of the plan.

CDD Rux wasn't aware of that. He noted they have talked a lot about 6% growth rate, and you would want to get projects to \$53.7 million dollars. When you look at the projects themselves, you could say you're only going to fund 75% of those projects and the other 25% is to be funded by other sources. Then you would take that \$1 million dollar project you're only going to spend \$750,000 on and add another \$1 million dollar project, but only spend \$750,000 by the time you're done and if you went a 25% reduction or 10% on a project you'd still come up with the \$53.7 million because that's going to set what your maximum indebtedness amount is.

Member Olson asked if they partially fund based on other sources. The projects that are in the Master Plan which are not relying on the Urban Renewal funds, would it make sense to not fund those. Knowing those were going to be a part of a normal funding stream. She also noted in the Downtown Area they don't need a parking garage.

CDD Rux responded it's possible to do that. He also noted the parking garage is not in the priority list because it was brought up in the last meeting to have three surface parking lots that were identified in the original list.

Member Olson agreed with Chair Bridges to not fully fund with Urban Renewal dollars projects which developers can assist with.

Chair Bridges asked in terms of the circumstance where SDCs are paying 25% or the developer paying 25% and the Urban Renewal Plan funding 75% of that \$1 million dollar project, he asked do we have to show detail of the project on what the alternative resources are or can we say we're going to have a plan that's 10% more than \$53 million dollars.

CDD Rux noted you don't want to do the 10% more, we're going to have to break it down. If you want some projects funded by developers, SDCs or grants, for example you're going to have to fund a project at 75%, he noted they will have to figure out the project cost and if the project cost is \$1 million dollars they'll have to find something in the plan that tells alternative funding sources to make that project happen.

Member Olson noted when she first went through the list and prioritized where there where SDC and grant possibilities, she put a multiplier on it so she could keep a running total.

CDD Rux noted at the November 23rd meeting there was a list of potential projects all from conversations on what leverages new investment that's coming in. That list was a \$65.3 million dollars and we have spent a lot of time at the \$117 million dollars and getting it down. Another way is to say, of that \$65.3 million dollars maybe \$53.7 or \$61.9 million dollars, depending on the growth rate, but that list had some key critical projects that are already in the priority list. He and Brett talked about some infrastructure projects downtown undergrounding that may not be the best leverage to do that infill development. In the last meeting there was conversation about those projects related to the Mill Site, starting with the industrial, where do you get the investment in the buildings and equipment and all of the infrastructure to support it. The list that Brett put together in the Riverfront Area had all of those street, water, wastewater and storm systems that help support the development of the Mill Site property. There was also conversation about commercial for both the Riverfront Area, because it's a vertical mixed use and the vertical mixed use in the Downtown Area. What is the infrastructure pieces you need in order to get that development on these infill lots is sewer, stormwater, water and the transportation pieces. He noted he asked Brett to have in the back of his mind this evening as we're talking about projects in the downtown area, what some of the underground infrastructure project are that may not be the highest priority that could be cut off the list or those that may be something a developer does or they find other funding sources to be able to move these forward. The other piece was the Esplanade its full length and the Bypass Trail missing piece from River Street to College Street and making those connections was another part of the conversation from last week.

CDD Rux noted there has to be a final project list no later than March 8th, because the consultant needs to go through and do the financial modeling in order for us to get to a point of going to City Council in August of 2021.

Member Morelock noted he finds it a danger to count on money that they don't have. When looking at projects and starting to trim down the list and say we will fund 75% and the other 25% is from other funding, it is a bad plan when it comes to planning for infrastructure projects. He noted he doesn't think it is the best move to try to trim but to make some hard decisions and if we need to cut \$27 million then we cut it, because we can't fund everything. He noted he would like to hear from CDD Rux and Brett. He noted it is important to know what is feasible. He said from a funding standpoint it is always dangerous to talk about grants and funds that we don't have in hand or that we're not taxing for that we know will have in hand. He also noted a conservative growth rate is a better place to be, it may be fewer dollars, but he thinks it is important not to mess around with those numbers. He noted to make a solid choice based upon the data they have and make some hard choices about the cuts that have to be made on the list. He said to be cautious about moving the growth rate up or down too much and making estimated guesses on what amount of money is from outside sources, because that is a bad fiscal plan for a municipality or the School District.

Chair Bridges noted he feels there is a difference between counting on grant money versus counting on SDC money. He noted they are planning on having growth for this plan to work so SDC money is going to get paid in with the payment cycle of 20 years while the plan has a 30 year cycle. He said you can reasonably advance SDC money, if there is a project that you're planning on collecting 20% from SDCs you fund the whole project right now to make it ready for development and there is an agreement to get paid back from the SDC fund. Otherwise he feels they are losing the advantage and the system of SDCs on those projects. Likewise the City, as he understands it, can engage in development

agreements on a property. If they build all of the street infrastructure which makes developable property on both sides of the street, the City can create an agreement where they funded what the developer should have funded for a 20 year period, they then can collect that back from the developer when the development actually happens on their property. He noted they collect back that portion which the developer would have paid had they done their development first, so he said it is fiscally responsible to make sure they take advantage of those two topics, developer agreements and SDCs. He noted he agrees with Member Morelock relating to grants. He noted he is selling the Urban Renewal District to people and this is another piece of the funding and if these two pieces are taken away it is fiscally un-conservative.

Member Morelock noted the money is going to come in but the base were leveraging on he feels that's where the SDCs will come in, but what if there is no development and projects do not get fully funded. He asked that the list go down further and later when the SDC money is there and enough to do for example the sewer project that is not on the list.

Chair Bridges noted if a project is not on the list they cannot do it and have it funded by the Urban Renewal or SDCs. He noted if they cut the list and pair it down to \$53 million dollars because they made that tough choice they can't spend money on that project later.

Member Morland asked about where the SDCs get spent.

Chair Bridges noted there are a number of projects that are SDC eligible but not in our geographic boundary.

Member Clements agrees with Chair Bridges because the methodology for establishing SDCs is a very important factor.

CDD Rux noted there are projects that are SDC eligible to be funded and then funded by Urban Renewal. That requires engineering to go back to their master list of projects and determine if they backfill other projects for what was going to now be funded by another source or do they shorten the project list which then reduces SDC costs.

Chair Bridges asked if they maximize what SDCs they can leverage on the priority list and maximize what they can do through development agreements, does Engineering have to go back and relook at how they reduce down those different project costs.

CDD Rux noted on the priority projects at the Riverfront on E Fourteenth Street, there is a note #1 that says this project is not a current City of Newberg infrastructure Master Plan it does not have SDC eligibility associated with it, it needs to be in a Master Plan. He noted E Fourteenth Street extension which is from River Street to Dog Ridge Street is not SDC eligible. The water project and the storm project are not SDC eligible. Industrial Street number 1, is not SDC Eligible.

Member Clements asked where it has a note #1 are they all not SDC eligible.

CDD Rux responded that is correct. He noted when they look at a lot of what's in the Riverfront Area it is not SDC eligible. One of the potential projects off the list is Fourteenth Street sidewalks from College Street to River Street, that's 34% of that project is SDC eligible. The other item that has SDC eligibility tied to it is down under the wastewater, where the lift station and the force main B1 both are 91% eligible for SDC expenditures.

Member Clements asked if a lot of the Riverfront property is still not in the City.

CDD Rux responded the City is working through annexations to bring property into the Riverfront Area. If they looked at each of the sub areas and each of those projects it tells us if a project is SDC eligible and tells us the percentage that is eligible. If they annex then that can become SDC eligible, than they have to go back to update all of the Master Plans, which they are in the process of doing. City Council is working on establishing a subcommittee to look at all the City's SDCs, so there is a bit of unknown there as well. He noted they are updating the Transportation, Sewer, and Water Master Plans, and listing projects that align with the Riverfront Master Plan. They are not doing anything to update the SDCs until City Council has their discussion about the methodology.

Chair Bridges noted for example of the three items of wastewater is 91% SDC eligible which is about \$1.5 million dollars, we're able to fund \$1.5 million dollars' worth of projects. Build out all these lift station improvements and over future development of 20 years will recoup about \$1.365 million dollars in funding that was loaned to the infrastructure.

CDD Rux responded that methodology is correct. For example the wastewater sub-areas and the lift station was not an Urban Renewal listed project, they couldn't spend any Urban Renewal dollars. Developments happening west of College

Street is listed on the Urban Renewal Plan. The lift station might cost \$777,000 we could have the funding and issue debt, we would have to take that methodology and put it in the SDCs that would be collected to pay back the Urban Renewal Program. Then the question is, have there been other projects that were on the original master list that you wanted to fund, but didn't have the dollars to fund. If you don't have the Urban Renewal dollars up front you can't build a lift station in the development, so everything sits there on vacant land because the development doesn't happen. Then they're not creating the new property taxes in order to feed the Capital Improvement Projects for the next private development project. He noted he wants to caution that you don't want to have to explain this to the public that it sounds like your trading this project for that project because the public will not understand.

Chair Bridges noted for those who do understand won't they ask why you didn't take advantage of this other resource if you're creating an Urban Renewal District to be able to be a partner with these other taxing districts and why give away \$1.3 million dollars that could have gone to projects.

Member Olson noted also those who do understand might ask why would you gave away \$1.3 million dollars instead of making the developer do what you normally make them do. She added she thinks it is explainable if Brett went through the list and added it up, how much of that do you want to require to come back into SDCs. She noted it would help to know how much potential is there.

Brett noted there are not that many projects that are in a very high level of SDC. That 91% for the wastewater project are high, and the Blaine Street extension is 100%. In looking at the other projects they don't have that larger percentage and he doesn't anticipate it to be a very large number.

Chair Bridges noted on CDD Rux's comment that the developer agreement is individually negotiated, but what he was referring to was advanced financing agreements, maybe not the correct term, but he understood that the City has a tool where they could build out infrastructure that would require a developer to invest the money ahead of time. If the developer comes in and develops their property, they recoup a proportionate share that the developer would have done if they came forward to develop their property and it lasts for 20 years.

CDD Rux noted in Newberg it's private development building infrastructure, so for example, a lift station, the developer wants to develop a piece of property that requires a lift station, which will serve other properties in the surrounding area in the future. The developer builds that lift station, then comes to the city and enters into an advanced financing agreement, which means when later development comes in they pay back a proportional share towards that lift station improvement. The city didn't put the money up front, the developer put that money up front.

Chair Bridges noted that it is a 10 year agreement correct and he thought that there was a corollary concept that the government could do.

CDD Rux replied yes it is a 10 year agreement. He noted there is development agreements where there could be a water, sewer or transportation traffic signal. For example a developer comes in and the City invests \$150 million dollars on a new building and enters into a development agreement with them to build the specific project of this minimum value. The City will do the infrastructure component of the project, but the developer funds the private development. For example, the infrastructure component of this project he dealt with, a project where they already built the roads but there was a brand new water line, other transportation improvements and a new traffic signal, the Urban Renewal Agency did all the water line work and the developer built the traffic signal.

Chair Bridges asked if there was any way for the Urban Renewal District to enter into an agreement with the City to do the improvements and charge future developers when they build out their property to reimburse the Urban Renewal District.

CDD Rux noted yes, you start with the basic premises that the City now has an Urban Renewal Agency and the City will be entering into an IGA to provide some administrative costs to run the Urban Renewal Agency. Then for example the City could have a \$2 million dollar road project that the Urban Renewal Agency wants to borrow money from the Infrastructure Financing Authority through Business Oregon, because it is going to bring this project \$xx million dollars in that agreement. Then the Urban Renewal Agency is pledging to pay back the City all of the principle and debt on that loan.

Member Ulven noted she would like to see the trolley study deleted but it only adds \$87,000 and doesn't feel it is a significant progress.

Member Stoller agrees with deleting the trolley study.

Chair Bridges noted everyone seems to want to eliminate the trolley study and he noted to eliminate it.

Chair Bridges noted he thought they we're going to have all the properties have the stormwater projects developed on the properties, but on the first page of attachment 2, there's \$5 million dollars of Riverfront storm projects.

Brett responded they are related to street improvements for the conveyance within the right-of-way. There are is a lot of the stormwater, the treatment component will happen on private property for those developments. Those would be projects for conveyance within the street and water quality treatment for the streets themselves.

Member Parish asked if there is an area that might be less important to develop then another area.

CDD Rux noted at the previous meeting the discussion focused around the Mill Site property as industrial. That is where investment would come because there will be job creation. The next tier was commercial vertical mixed use which applied to some of the Riverfront Area, but mostly to the Downtown Area.

Member Parish noted the Downtown Area is only showing about \$2 million. For some streets there's a lot of water and sewer projects.

Brett noted the way this was structured where there were water and sewer projects with the street, those were put with the street.

Member Parish noted she doesn't want to see taking out the Downtown Area projects because it's easier to pick. She feels the public would be asking why they are spending all this money on the Mill Site and not in the Downtown Area.

Member Stoller responded, isn't that the point of what we're doing now, for example we're building Noah's Ark so that people will come and we could expand down on the south side.

Member Olson noted they could take \$1 million out of surface parking. Urban Renewal is paying for some increased parking downtown but not all of it.

Chair Bridges asked about taking the surface parking down from 3 lots to 2 lots.

CDD Rux noted each surface parking lot is about \$550,000. He noted to change the \$2.6 million for surface parking and take it down to \$1.5 million, which no one had an objection to.

Member Olson noted taking Member Parish's approach and look at cutting larger dollar projects such as the Howard Street and First Street road diet and if there was any way of partially funding them to reduce the cost of the programs.

Brett responded it depends on where the monies would come from. He said related to the notes 1 and 2 on the SDC component, there's a note on the First Street project to recognize that it is in a Master Plan but not SDC eligible.

Chair Bridges asked CDD Rux if when doing the study for First Street and Hancock Street road diet was Hancock Street as critical as doing First Street.

CDD Rux responded yes and explained what the road diet project is. It is from the west end of the couplet to the east end of the couplet, to the east end from the west end. The east end of the couplet one travel lane gets removed and the sidewalks are widen for the pedestrian connectivity. Hancock heading southbound on Hwy 99 when you get to College Street it will need to be maintained as three lanes up to College Street because of the turning movements and traffic volume. From College Street one block to the east of Main Street it would be narrowed down to two travel lanes in each direction with wider sidewalks and also to provide on-street parking on the north side. The last block needs to be three lanes because of the traffic volumes.

Chair Bridges noted apparently Hancock Street needs to stay three lanes at each end, he asked what about shrinking it to two lanes in the middle, is it critical to First Street road diet.

CDD Rux explained part of the Downtown Plan was to create the pedestrian-friendly walkable downtown, which came up at the last meeting. The consultant and the traffic engineers at the time ran through all of the modeling and said okay to do that you would need to do this. It also requires that you need to have what is called alternative mobility standards because of the intersections not meeting the volume to capacity State requirement. He noted they are having conversations with ODOT about what's called a special transportation area designation downtown, which will give us those mobility standard flexibility. It is also tied to Phase 2 of the Bypass, so the truck traffic can move onto Highway 18 and allow the capacity for the local traffic. He noted these projects have lots of other pieces to them. In theory could we do the road diet on First Street and not the road diet on Hancock Street, yes and he would have to figure out how to deal with the special transportation area.

Member Morelock noted since they are looking at the big numbers and having to balance the Riverfront Area versus the Downtown Area, for instance in sub-area "A" it is \$18.5 million dollars. He suggests cut out the First Street and Hancock Street road diet because they're both large numbers.

Chair Bridges noted the reason he brought up Hancock Street is because he thinks that First Street is far more critical to walkability to the Historic Downtown area. With the diagonal parking it slows down traffic because vehicles are backing out into traffic. He suggests to not do the Hancock Street road diet as part of this plan. In the industrial area he thinks they should do it and asked about in some portions of the sub-area "A" that are furthest from the infrastructure improvements. For example we're going to do all this infrastructure for this loop of water and transportation loop. If we think of a spoked wheel we're not going to do these little spokes that are going to come off that wheel, so we develop from the center and not worry about the outlying areas and he asked can we save infrastructure spending on spending money in area in sub-area "A" and "B" with something like that.

Brett noted related to the waterline looping that is already done, there's a mainline loop created but not the fingers or the rest of it that goes along there.

Member Findley asked what kind of impact on the rest of the project it would have if they cut \$2.7 million of the Riverfront lift station.

CDD Rux noted the lift station would serve residential and the mixed commercial developments. He noted the south side of Fourteenth street and to the west of College Street and Waterfront Street some of the sewer would go north up College Street and a lot goes to the west and loops back around underneath the Bypass and back down Weatherly Way to the lift station then forced back to River Street.

Brett noted the lift station would take everything over to River Street. Right now the development that's out there goes to the lift station that is there and it would ultimately go away. The long term idea is the Riverfront lift station would replace those. It has been designed to be able to gravity towards where this future lift station is proposed for the existing Riverrun subdivision.

CDD Rux noted to think of when you get from College Street going east on Fourteenth, north of the Bypass it's a topography is such they can gravity the wastewater to the east, but before you get to College Street they have to gravity it to the west and then to the lift station and pump it back to the east.

Chair Bridges noted to follow up on Brett's comments, that he said the loop system for the water is already there in sub-area "A" and that it's just a matter of adding these lines that are going to go out to facilitate development. The question is should they eliminate some of those lines that are going to go out, recognizing that we're not going to have as much developable area, and money to do all of it.

Brett noted to clarify his earlier statement, there was a large main loop that was put in there and we have these industrial streets through the Mill District and those did add some water lines along the main spokes off of that well for those streets but not any finger streets that would come off of that. Those potential projects that could go away as part of some of those water line components if that is the direction everyone wants to go.

CDD Rux noted to think of it this way, at the water treatment plant there's the main distribution pipe that goes north through the Mill Site up to Wynoski Street. The issue is tying into that main pipe and going to the west following along the Bluff Road down Fourteenth Street, then at College Street there is one line that goes up and underneath the Bypass

and loops. What they are trying to do is get that first loop in from the water plant up the Bluff Road down Fourteenth Street to College Street to tie back into the water line that gives the first big loop and creates your fire flow. The secondary levels of that would be the water line that goes down Waterfront Street that loops back over to Weatherly Way. On the Mill Site there are north-south and east-west roads that make these sub-loop areas depending on how the developments are going to occur in that 100 plus acres. He noted they are trying to make sure they have the main pipe in to create that main loop.

Chair Bridges asked about reducing the 100 plus developable acres and create 87 developable acres.

Member Morelock noted the option is to cut everything except for sub-area "A" "F" and "H" and you then have your cut of \$27 million. He noted maybe they need to look at areas that cannot get done. He asked CDD Rux if they need to do something in every area

CDD Rux said they do not but would like to spread it out so everyone get some benefit.

Member Olson suggested looking at sub-area "H" which is the Downtown Area. There are the parts which are the trolley, wayfinding, pedestrian furniture and the building façade program which are not required as much as trying to fix First Street. They could take \$4 to \$5 million out of the \$27 million and still do a good job for the Downtown Area.

Member Parish agrees there are a lot of things they could take out and maybe try to raise some funds because it is so visual.

Member Morelock noted in looking to value engineering, they either do them or do the project like if they want to make a walkable downtown you need both Hancock Street and First Street as they're big dollar amounts, but if we're choosing those over doing other infrastructure projects in areas. He noted he is just giving the scope of the cuts if they do sub-areas "A", "H" and "F" with everything else is off the table.

Chair Bridges asked CDD Rux or Brett if there was any problem with this proposal to keep sub-areas "A" "H" and "F".

CDD Rux noted they will need to bring the number down, which means they are going to have to come back on March 8, because there some critical things to make the Riverfront work that happen in the Downtown area. You have to have the traffic signal at First Street and Blaine Street. They need the Blaine Street extension from Ninth Street to College Street. They need the River Street improvements because that's the two ways in and the third way is Wynooski Street. There are some Wynooski frontage improvements from Dog Ridge to the Bypass. Those are some critical ways to get into the Riverfront and also tie directly into the Downtown Area. The whole idea about not doing Hancock Street he wants to think a little bit more about and to see if they can still get a walkable downtown if that project isn't funded. They need to make sure that the sewer and water and these other roadway work are all tied together for tearing up the road and have the infrastructure underneath it before you finish the road surface so you don't have to dig up a road that was just finish a few years ago. He noted ok on reducing the number of the parking lots downtown, the trolley and the pedestrian furniture piece. He noted last meeting there was the question about pedestrian connectivity north and south to get to the Cultural Center and one of those projects is Howard Street from First Street to Sheridan Street, he asked if they still want that piece or if it is not a high priority they can take it out. He noted in sub-area H they have River Street that goes from First Street to Third Street that's part of the whole River Street project because there is different segments of the roadway. Doing Wynooski north of the Bypass he noted they don't need to do. In sub-area E there's some they don't need to do that the developers could come in and do.

CDD Rux asked, what are the main spines of that infrastructure are necessary in order to make this all work. Then on the Mill Site specifically from the east side of River Street to Wynooski, what infrastructure is needed there to support development because that is where your biggest investment is going to come from.

Chair Bridges noted it sounds like they want to focus on the Downtown Area and the Mill Site area and do the critical projects in those two areas. Have something that links them together that is a functional transportation system and or utility system. It is about \$4 million dollars from the budget for Downtown Area that could be cut. He noted he wants to keep the piece about SDCs in the discussion and to take advantage of that.

CDD Rux noted there are a lot of line improvements and transportation improvements to the west of College Street down to Waterfront Street they could have development fund those, and several million dollars could come off the list.

Growth Rate

Chair Bridges explained why he asked for a growth rate of 6.5%. He noted how this plan works as you don't get to go back and change the growth rate. His recommendation is a termination date of 30 years. If you don't reach your goal because it's going to terminate you don't get harmed, but if you recommend a number too low you get harmed because you limit projects. He noted Newberg grows faster than Yamhill County, McMinnville and sometimes faster than the Metro Area. Newberg has a per Capita industrial job base that is higher than all those areas. He feels the conservative choice is to choose the number that's a bit higher than what's happened in the past, otherwise we shortchange ourselves in terms of what we can budget for. If for some reason the rate isn't met then it means that the District has to decide going forward, because there's priorities in the plan, but we're not going to get to all the priorities.

Member Olson noted what Elaine said previously is that the downside of going higher and the risk was that you can set expectations on the project list that we won't meet. She noted she agrees with Chair Bridges that 6.5% growth rate allows us to get the most we can out of the Urban Renewal District.

Member Stoller noted he agrees with Chair Bridges and he wouldn't be overly concerned with 6.5%, not to mention the fact that they could potentially be leaving projects on the table if they weren't more aggressive.

Member Clements also agrees with the 6.5% growth rate.

Member Ulven agrees.

Member Findley agrees.

Member Morelock noted he gave his opinion earlier but won't stand in the way.

Member Parrish had no comment.

CDD Rux noted that he and Brett will get together this week and take the comments based on the guidance of 6.5% growth rate, which means the target project cost is \$61.9 million dollars in 2020 dollar value and they will come back as close as they can get.

Project Timeline

CDD Rux noted meeting number 10 will be on March 8, 2021. On March 22, 2021 will be the first version of the plan. April 6, 2021 will have a virtual open house which the sub-consultant from JLA is putting together material for the open house. He noted they are also doing a couple videos that they budgeted for in the feasibility study. The last meeting is scheduled for May 24, 2021 and we will be looking for a recommendation on the Urban Renewal Plan and report. He noted he and Elaine have meetings with overlapping Taxing Districts and with the County with the target of getting to the City Council for their first hearing on August 2, 2021 and adoption of an ordinance of the Plan and Report on August 16, 2021. He noted that Elaine had mentioned that a big section of the document will be in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan, and they have functional Master Plans they are in the process of being updated.

Member Ulven noted if it's useful she will get CDD Rux on their board of director's schedule. She noted he has provided a good precursor to what would be coming back during this process and that she has been keeping them informed.

CDD Rux noted he has a separate distribution list of the Taxing District organization members, so they can follow the progress of each meeting. He noted there is a 45 day consultant/confer process so they will be meeting with the Taxing District to provide their comments as they get towards the end of the 45 day period.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

None

ITEMS FROM STAFF:

None

ITEMS FROM COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

None

ADJOURNMENT:

Chair Bridges adjourned meeting at 7:06pm

**APPROVED BY THE AD HOC URBAN RENEWAL CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE this
March 22, 2021**

John Bridges, UR CAC Chair

Doug Rux, Recording Secretary

AD HOC URBAN RENEWAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Meeting Minutes

March 8, 2021 6:00 PM

NEWBERG CITY HALL

Meeting held electronically due to COVID-19 pandemic

(This is for historical purposes as meetings are permanent retention documents and this will mark this period in our collective history)

Chair John Bridges called the meeting to order at 5:30pm

ROLL CALL

Members Present: John Bridges, Chair
Francisco Stoller, Vice Chair
Stephanie Findley
Molly Olson
Don Clements
Joe Morelock
Josh Duder
Cassandra Ulven
Loni Parrish,

Members Absent: Rick Rogers, excused

Staff Present: Doug Rux, Community Development Director
Brett Musick, Senior Engineer
Shannon Buckmaster, Economic Health Manager

Chair Bridges noted that Angel Aguiar has resigned from this committee, both he and CDD Rux thanked him for his service. He noted Angel and his wife are going to start a three year mission in Columbia South America.

CONSENT CALENDAR:

None

NEW BUSINESS:

Prioritization of project list to match financial capacity

Chair Bridges noted tonight they need to decide on the project list. He noted that CDD Rux sent out the refined documents. He would like CDD Rux to go through what has changed on the list and how this new project list got down to the number it's at.

CDD Rux noted they went through all the comments and suggestions about projects that could be removed from the list, while still focusing on the fact of infrastructure in sub-area A. He noted he walked away with sub-areas A through H and playing off of industrial were important and that the hierarchy of moving down from the industrial is commercial, commercial mixed use, vertical mixed use components and transportation infrastructure serving down into the Riverfront Area. There were comments about not needing to address the issue of Hancock Street road diet, so they took that into consideration. They asked what infrastructure projects are necessary to serve the infill development within the Downtown Area which address the vertical mixed use component.

CDD Rux noted there were some comments about cutting \$30 million dollars out of the list, but when the Committee said that the growth rate would be at 6.5% that meant a project value of \$61.9 million in 2020 dollar values. They went back to the consultant team and said, okay we need to address the issue of administration and how do we categorize that for 2020.

He noted you see a number there of \$5.7 million dollars, but the administration cost is still \$9.93 million dollars because they escalate this over the 30 year period and that is the number we need to start with.

CDD Rux also talked with the consultants about bond costs, because Urban Renewal works by selling bonds and operate in debt up until the end of the Plan. The consultant provided some numbers which are included in the material. He noted they also paid attention to the conversation about leveraging and what to do about SDC's and Grants. They went back and looked at what projects were SDC eligible and not eligible. A lot of the projects in sub-area A & B were not SDC eligible. We also paid attention saying, we're only going to College Street with some infrastructure and private development can take care of infrastructure down Waterfront Street. They looked at sub-area C for example, they have the wastewater system and SDCs are going to pay for the majority of that improvement and is back filled it with Urban Renewal Funds.

CDD Rux noted after going through all the numbers with Brett, they ended up in the Downtown Area, with First Street, a couple parking lots, the intersection at College Street and Hancock Street. Blaine Street, which was not necessarily a priority of the committee last time, they found the resources to do it, which is one of the main transportation corridors going down into the Riverfront Area.

CDD Rux noted they looked at different pieces about SDCs, and that it is important to keep in mind that SDCs are based on a 20 year horizon program, where the Urban Renewal program is based on a 30 year program, so they look at the opportunity to leverage, there may be projects where you see some Urban Renewal dollars allocated with also SDCs. He noted it's important for the Urban Renewal program to work with the City, the City Council and Urban Renewal Agency as they're updating SDC methodologies and projects and that the Urban Renewal Agency advocates for proportional share towards those improvement projects. For example, the Blane Street extension from Ninth Street down to College Street, it says 100% SDC eligible, but it's a critical component of making the Riverfront Project work. If we don't have the transportation then we cannot have the development. This is one where the Urban Renewal Agency will be working with the City to have the Urban Renewal Agency pay for this roadway, but maybe they'll get some dollars back later, which it puts the Urban Renewal Agency in a position if there is another critical project just off the list they may be able to do in order to leverage addition development.

CDD Rux noted that is the approach that they took over the course of last week and that they had one week to try to reconfigure all of these numbers. They were able to have a project list, admin costs and bond which came in at \$61.9 million dollars. He noted in the packet you'll see lines that are drawn in red that are deleted projects, it may be a project or an element of a project. They fine-tuned what was Urban Renewal feasible and what might be SDC eligible to get to the \$61.9 million dollar number.

Brett noted in the packet on the summary sheet there are various changes made as they went through these refinements highlighted and captured in the notes. The projects that are lined out in red, he was going through and refining these looking for redundancies, such as sidewalks along the Riverfront Area on Fourteenth Street between College Street and River Street. There's also the multi-use path through the Bypass Trail, which he took one out and kept the Bypass Trail. He noted there were street projects that it was assumed the cost included stormwater conveyance and it showed up in the Transportation System Plan projects, but the stormwater component was not there so they did some adjusting to make it fit with the projects. In the Riverfront Area the lift station at the gravity main is a component they kept because that is a main piece of the Riverfront Area. The water lines of the Downtown Area they focused on making certain they are working on the older and under sized lines, versus other items, to make the most efficient use of the dollars as possible.

Member Ulven noted she would like to say this is exactly the focus and refinement and professional input that was needed to narrow down the list. She applauds the staff for the tremendous amount of work done. She noted it is easy to understand and feels they did an outstanding job in such a short amount of time.

Member Stoller agreed with Member Ulven and said it was amazing.

Member Clements noted he agrees and that Attachment 1 was very well put together.

Chair Bridges noted there were several places where they we're going to change the cost of this project because 91% is SDC eligible and that it needs to be in the Plan document. He noted the continuing Committee and the City Council will need to make sure projects that are in these boundaries are SDC eligible and stay SDC eligible. They need to make sure that they are negotiating with the City, for example, we will up front this money, but need to make sure it is paid back through SDCs so we can move on to the next project. As CDD Rux and the consultant has confirmed, is if they're diligent in whether they backfill SDC repayment or get a developer agreement that they take advantage of, or get a grant, they can add projects to the list if they're actively trying to preserve reimbursement opportunities. He noted this is a fantastic list and is in favor as drafted. He noted to make it work well they need to keep in mind to preserve the projects on the SDC list to make sure they can get the SDC reimbursement and that they need to be advocates for the Plan to maximize everything.

Member Parish thought earlier it was said they couldn't add new projects to the list.

Chair Bridges responded they can only add up to an additional 1% of property and if more you have to go through the whole process again. But for example, they can add onto the list sidewalks that would have been taken off the list.

CDD Rux noted what's important for everyone, is that you're starting off with the initial project list that meet the \$61.9 million dollars in 2020 dollar values, which equates to about \$114 million dollars in maximum indebtedness. He noted as the Plan matures over time there will be language within the Plan itself that talks about amendments. What we see is they have a minor amendment project, major amendment project and a substantial amendment project. A substantial amendment project is when you're going to expand your Urban Renewal Boundary there's a statutory process that they have to go through. A minor amendment process to the Plan is if you wanted to trade a project out later in time, you can set a dollar value and if a project is under this dollar value, you can eliminate a project and add a new project of equal value. The minor amendment projects are approved by the Urban Renewal Agency board. The major amendment projects might have another monetary threshold on a project value, for example a project isn't as important as was thought in 2021, but this other project is important in order to leverage to get this development to increase assessed value. He noted environmental influences change things over time, but there are processes in Urban Renewal to make the changes to respond to the development needs and creates that additional assessed value and job growth that occurs.

CDD Rux noted the focus on infrastructure to leverage new development is predominantly what this is all about. There are a couple of community amenity pieces that we have talked about, the esplanade is one the community kept coming up with when dealing with the Riverfront Master Plan. There were some issues about downtown parking that came up in meetings and in the list they have provided additional opportunities for parking in the Downtown Area to help support the business. The other piece is about the vertical development, leveraging the ground floor commercial with housing above both in the Riverfront Area and the Downtown Area. They worked diligently to make sure they were capturing the right infrastructure pieces identified in the Plan to make those projects happen over the life of the Plan.

Chair Bridges noted he would entertain a motion.

MOTION: Member Olson and Member Parrish motion to approve the Urban Renewal project list as presented at this March 8, 2021 Citizens Advisory Committee meeting, Motion carried 9/0

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

None

ITEMS FROM STAFF:

CDD Rux reminded everyone of the upcoming meetings. He will be getting information to the consultant team that are working on the Urban Renewal Plan and Report. They need this information for Nick to be able to start dropping it into the financial models. He, Brett and the consultant team will start to look at the year anticipating when these projects may happen. He noted in May 2021 they will be looking for a final recommendation of the Plan and Report.

Chair Bridges asked CDD Rux when he anticipates he will have a draft of the Plan.

CDD Rux noted the next meeting on March 22, 2021 they will have an initial draft of the Plan.

ITEMS FROM COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

Member Olson and all the Committee members noted great job

ADJOURNMENT:

Chair Bridges adjourned meeting at 5:55pm

**APPROVED BY THE AD HOC URBAN RENEWAL CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE this
March 22, 2021**

John Bridges, UR CAC Chair

Doug Rux, Recording Secretary

PLAN GOALS

The goals of the Newberg Urban Renewal Plan come directly from existing publicly vetted and City Council adopted documents. A *NewBERG Community Vision* provides an overall vision for the city of Newberg identified as Goals A and B below. The *City of Newberg Riverfront Master Plan* provides the goals for the Riverfront. The *City of Newberg Downtown Improvement Plan* provide goals for the Downtown. The urban renewal plan is an implementation tool to enable the city to undertake projects already identified in these documents and in City of Newberg Master Plans within the urban renewal area. There are many other Newberg planning documents that provide support to the projects identified in this Plan. Those are reviewed in Chapter __ of this Plan.

The goals of the Plan represent its basic intents and purposes. Accompanying each goal are objectives, which generally describe how the Agency intends to achieve each goal. The urban renewal projects identified in Sections V and VI of the Plan are the specific means of meeting the objectives. The goals and objectives will be pursued as economically as is feasible and at the discretion of the Agency. The goals and objectives are not listed in any order of importance or priority. A matrix of how the projects align with the goals and objectives is shown in Table 2.

Goal A: ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Goal 1. Enhance industrial development capabilities and opportunities

- Retention and expansion of existing industrial businesses
- Recruitment of traded sector companies
- Ensure adequate utilities (water, sewer, storm draining, electricity, natural gas and telecommunications) to support industrial growth
- Improve transportation access for industrial land

Goal 2. Enhance commercial development capabilities and opportunities

- Redevelop vacant and underutilized commercial/retail sites
- Support creation of new retail/commercial businesses

Goal 4: Complete funding, administrative, and organizational actions for Newberg Downtown Improvement Plan

- Create an Urban Renewal District

Goal B: LIVABILITY & DEVELOPMENT

Goal 1. Blend the built environment with surrounding natural landscape

Goal 2. Improve multi-modal transportation

- Complete ADA Spot Improvement Program projects for Primary Critical Routes to improve walkability in accordance with the Newberg Transportation System Plan
- Complete bicycle lanes and lane treatments along planned routes established by the Newberg Transportation System Plan

Goal 4. Complete Downtown Improvement Plan

- Implement First Street improvement projects
- Implement West End/Mill District Project
- Implement Second Street Mixed-use District Projects
- Implement Catalyst Development Projects

Goal 5. Improve Infrastructure

- Increase the supply of industrial and commercial/retail land
- Ensure adequate utilities (water, sewer, storm draining, electricity, natural gas and telecommunications) to support industrial growth
- Improve transportation access for industrial land

Goal C: RIVERFRONT AREA

Goal 1. Provide a mix of land uses: public, residential, commercial/mixed use, and industrial.

Goal 2. Plan for a multi-modal transportation network to provide access and connections to the rest of the city, especially Downtown Newberg.

Goal 3. Preserve open space and incorporate natural features as part of the riverfront's strong sense of place.

Goal D: DOWNTOWN AREA

Goal 1. Downtown will be a vibrant, inviting, and fun destination for those coming from near and far.

Goal 2. Downtown streets will be pedestrian-friendly and safe for all modes of transportation.

Goal 3. Downtown will be the center for public life – a place to shop, work, visit, gather and play.

Goal 4. Downtown will have increased density, a diverse mix of businesses and a broad range of places in which to live.

Goal 5. Downtown will be easy to navigate through attractive, effective signage and physical connections between activity centers and districts

Goal 6. Downtown will have a variety of easy-to find parking options

Goal 7. Downtown will have the appropriate type and level of infrastructure to support the envisioned future type, mix and intensity of uses

Goal E: ADMINISTRATION

Goal 1. Provide for the administration of the urban renewal plan.

AMENDMENTS TO PLAN

The Plan may be amended as described in this section.

A. *Substantial Amendments*

Substantial Amendments, in accordance with ORS 457.085(2)(i), shall require the same notice, hearing, and approval procedure required of the original Plan, under ORS 457.095, including public involvement, consultation with taxing districts, presentation to the Agency, the Planning Commission, the County, and adoption by the City Council by non-emergency ordinance after a hearing. If there are unincorporated parcels within the Area at the time a Substantial Amendment is considered, it must also be approved by Yamhill County through adoption of a resolution by the Board of County Commissioners.

Notice of such hearing shall be provided to individuals or households within the City of Newberg, as required by ORS 457.120.

Notice of adoption of a Substantial Amendment shall be provided in accordance with ORS 457.095 and 457.115.

Substantial Amendments are amendments that:¹

1. Add land to the urban renewal area, except for an addition of land that totals not more than a cumulative 1% of the existing area of the urban renewal area; or
2. Increase the maximum amount of indebtedness that can be issued or incurred under the Plan.
3. Increase in duration or refunding indebtedness unless the increase is necessary to avoid a default on previously-issued indebtedness.

B. *Council Approved Amendments*

Council Approved Amendments are amendments that require approval by the Newberg City Council by adoption of a resolution. Council Approved Amendments are the addition of a project where the tax increment revenue share of the project cost exceeds \$500,000. This threshold may be inflated annually on the date of adoption of the Plan by the cost of inflation for projects as published by the Seattle Engineering News Record or other generally accepted record if the Seattle Engineering News Record is no longer published.

¹ Unless otherwise permitted by state law, no land equal to more than 20 percent of the total land area of the original Plan shall be added to the urban renewal area by amendments, and the aggregate amount of all amendments increasing the maximum indebtedness may not exceed 20 percent of the Plan's initial maximum indebtedness, as adjusted, as provided by law and by concurrence provisions in ORS 457.470.

C. Minor Amendments

Minor Amendments are amendments that are not Substantial Amendments or Council Approved Amendments as defined in this Plan and in ORS 457. Minor Amendments require approval by the Agency by resolution.

D. Amendments to the Sherwood Comprehensive Plan and/or Sherwood Municipal Code.

Amendments to the Newberg Comprehensive Plan and/or Newberg Municipal Code that affect the Plan and/or the Area shall be incorporated automatically within the Plan without any separate action required by the Agency or City Council. If a Substantial Amendment is prepared, the Section of this Plan on Relationship to Local Objectives should be updated.

DURATION AND REVIEW OF PLAN

A. Duration

The Agency intends that it not collect tax increment revenues for the Area after thirty years of tax increment collections. The Agency shall not initiate any Projects in the Area unless the Agency reasonably projects it will be able to pay for those Projects from the proceeds of indebtedness issued on or before FYE 2052, and from other funds available to the Agency. Except as provided in the next sentence, all indebtedness that is secured by the tax increment revenues of the Area shall mature no later than FYE 2052, and the Agency shall structure all its indebtedness so that it can be paid in full from the tax increment revenues of the Area that the Agency reasonably projects it will receive on or before FYE 2052. The Agency may issue refunding indebtedness that matures after FYE 2052, only if issuing that refunding indebtedness is necessary to avoid a default on previously-issued indebtedness.

B. Review of Plan

Every 5 years of the Plan from the date of first tax increment revenues, the Agency shall undertake a financial analysis of the Plan, including updated projections for tax increment finance revenues and evaluating the ability of the revenues to achieve or exceed the Plan's maximum indebtedness by the anticipated expiration date in FYE 2052. The Agency shall also review the project list for potential changes. The Agency shall consult and confer with affected taxing districts regarding the results of this financial and project update and will consider revenue sharing or shortening the time frame of the Plan if revenues are exceeding projections.

Sub Area	Projects		Total Cost
A	Public Transportation, Water, Wastewater and Storm Infrastructure	\$13,835,613	\$14,233,553
	Riverfront Trails	\$397,940	
	TOTAL		
B	Public Transportation, Water, Wastewater and Storm Infrastructure	\$3,334,010	\$3,585,702
	Riverfront Trails	\$251,692	
	TOTAL		
C	Public Transportation, Water, Wastewater and Storm Infrastructure	\$159,986	\$159,986
	TOTAL		
D	Public Transportation, Water, Wastewater and Storm Infrastructure	\$6,312,464	\$6,312,464
	TOTAL		
E	Public Transportation, Water, Wastewater and Storm Infrastructure	\$1,674,421	\$1,674,421
	TOTAL		
F	Public Transportation, Water, Wastewater and Storm Infrastructure	\$5,926,763	\$5,926,763
	TOTAL		
G	Public Transportation, Water, Wastewater and Storm Infrastructure	\$2,889,951	\$2,889,951
	TOTAL		
H	Public Transportation, Water, Wastewater and Storm Infrastructure	\$17,932,032	\$20,887,160
	Parking	\$1,121,928	
	Second Street	\$1,833,200	
	Undergrounding		
	TOTAL		
TOTAL PROJECTS			\$55,670,000
	ADMINISTRATION	\$5,730,000	\$5,730,000
	BONDING	\$500,000	\$500,000
GRAND TOTAL - URBAN RENEWAL PROJECT COST ESTIMATES - 2020			\$61,900,000

Area A Riverfront:

1. Transportation and Infrastructure
 - a) East Fourteenth Street Extension – South River Street to NE Dog Ridge Road. Includes street, curb, sidewalk, planter strip, street trees, and a water project.
 - b) East Industrial Street from East Fourteenth Street extension to Wyooski. Includes street, curb, sidewalk, planter strip, street trees, and water, wastewater projects.
 - c) South Industrial Street – Bypass to East Fourteenth Street extension.
 - d) South Industrial Street – East Industrial Street to East Fourteenth Street extension. Includes street, curb, sidewalk, planter strip, street trees, and a water project.
 - e) Wyooski Street – Bypass to Northeast Dog Ridge Road. Includes street, curb, sidewalk planter strip, and street trees.
2. Riverfront Trails
 - a) Esplanade south of Mill - Urban Multi-use Trail.

Area B Riverfront:

1. Transportation and Infrastructure
 - a) South River Street Improvements – Bypass to Rogers Landing Road. Includes street, curb, sidewalk, planter strip, street trees., and water and wastewater projects.
 - b) Rail crossing improvements No. 40A-000.40 at River Street.
 - c) East Fourteenth Street - South College Street to South River Street. Includes street, curb, sidewalk, planter strip, street trees and a water project.
2. Riverfront Trails
 - a) South River Street to South College Street – Urban Multi-Use Trail
 - b) Esplanade west of South River Street - Urban Multi-Use Trail

Area C Riverfront:

1. Wastewater projects
 - a) Riverfront Lift Station
 - b) Force Main B1
 - c) Gravity Main B4

Area D Riverfront:

1. Transportation and Infrastructure
 - a) South Blaine Street extension - East Ninth Street to South College Street. Includes street, curb, sidewalk, planter strip, street trees and a stormwater project.

- b) South College Street – South Ninth Street to East Fourteenth Street. Includes street, curb, sidewalk, planter strip, and street trees.
- c) Rail crossing improvements No. 40A-000.60 at College Street.

Area E Riverfront:

- 1. Transportation and Infrastructure
 - a) South River Street improvements - East Ninth Street to Bypass. Includes street, curb, sidewalk, planter strip, street trees, and water and stormwater projects.

Area F Riverfront:

- 1. Transportation and Infrastructure
 - a) South River Street improvements - East Third Street to East Ninth Street. Includes street, curb, sidewalk, planter strip, street trees, and wastewater and stormwater projects.

Area G: Downtown

- 1. Transportation and Infrastructure
 - a) Blaine Street – Third Street to Ninth Street. Includes street, curb, sidewalk, water, planter strip, street trees and a stormwater project.

Area H: Downtown

- 1. Transportation and Infrastructure
 - a) First Street Road Diet. Includes street, curb, sidewalk, planter strip, street trees, water line replacement, and wastewater and stormwater projects.
 - b) Meridian Street - Third Street to Sheridan Street. Includes street, curb, sidewalk, planter strip, street trees and water line replacement.
 - c) College Street – Third Street to Sheridan Street. Includes street, curb, sidewalk, planter strip, street trees, and line replacement.
 - d) Howard Street - Third Street to First Street. Includes street, curb, sidewalk, planter strip, street trees and water line replacement.
 - e) Washington Street – Third Street to Sheridan Street. Includes street, curb, sidewalk, planter strip, street trees, and water line replacement.
 - f) Main Street – Third Street to railroad tracks - Includes street, curb, sidewalk, planter strip, street trees, and water line replacement.

- g) Sheridan Street - railroad tracks to ½ block east of Main Street. Includes street, curb, sidewalk, planter strip, street trees, and water line replacement.
- h) Blaine Street – Hancock Street to Third Street. Includes street, curb, sidewalk, planter strip, street trees, and water project from East First Street to East Third Street.
- i) North College Street (Highway 219) at Hancock Street (Highway 99) Intersection Improvement - Add south bound right turn lane on North College Street.
- j) North Blaine Street/East Hancock Signal
- k) North Blaine Street/East First Street Signal
- l) South River Street improvements – east First Street to East Third Street. Includes street, curb, sidewalk, planter strip, street trees and wastewater and stormwater projects.
- m) Parking - Surface parking lots 1 and 2.

2. Utilities

- a) Second Street utility undergrounding.

The estimated total tax increment revenues by five year increments are shown below.

Total Net TIF	\$ 133,800,000
Maximum Indebtedness	\$ 114,900,000
Capacity (2020\$)	\$ 61,900,000
Years 1-5	\$ 4,400,000
Years 6-10	\$ 7,300,000
Years 11-15	\$ 10,600,000
Years 16-20	\$ 11,900,000
Years 21-25	\$ 13,300,000
Years 26-30	\$ 14,500,000

The following table shows the estimated tax increment revenues showing the total revenues , the anticipated frozen base of \$162,530,101, the estimated increment at 6.5% growth. This is multiplied by the tax rate in the area. This amount is adjusted for underpayments and delinquencies (5%) and for prior year's payments. This equals the total net tax increment revenues.

x

FYE	Assessed Value				Tax Rate	Tax Increment Finance				
	Total	Frozen Base	Increment - Used	Increment- Not Used		Gross TIF	Adjustments	Net TIF (Current Year)	Net TIF (Prior Year)	Net TIF (Total)
2023	\$ 184,345,703	\$ 162,530,101	\$ 21,815,602	\$ -	\$ 12.6424	\$ 275,801	\$ (13,790)	\$ 262,011	\$ -	\$ 262,011
2024	\$ 196,328,174	\$ 162,530,101	\$ 33,798,073	\$ -	\$ 12.6424	\$ 427,288	\$ (21,364)	\$ 405,923	\$ 3,930	\$ 409,853
2025	\$ 209,089,506	\$ 162,530,101	\$ 46,559,405	\$ -	\$ 12.6424	\$ 588,621	\$ (29,431)	\$ 559,190	\$ 6,089	\$ 565,279
2026	\$ 222,680,324	\$ 162,530,101	\$ 60,150,223	\$ -	\$ 12.6424	\$ 760,441	\$ (38,022)	\$ 722,419	\$ 8,388	\$ 730,807
2027	\$ 237,154,545	\$ 162,530,101	\$ 74,624,444	\$ -	\$ 12.6424	\$ 943,430	\$ (47,171)	\$ 896,258	\$ 10,836	\$ 907,095
2028	\$ 252,569,591	\$ 162,530,101	\$ 90,039,490	\$ -	\$ 12.6424	\$ 1,138,312	\$ (56,916)	\$ 1,081,397	\$ 13,444	\$ 1,094,841
2029	\$ 268,986,613	\$ 162,530,101	\$ 106,456,512	\$ -	\$ 12.6424	\$ 1,345,862	\$ (67,293)	\$ 1,278,569	\$ 16,221	\$ 1,294,790
2030	\$ 286,470,743	\$ 162,530,101	\$ 123,940,642	\$ -	\$ 12.6424	\$ 1,566,903	\$ (78,345)	\$ 1,488,558	\$ 19,179	\$ 1,507,737
2031	\$ 305,091,339	\$ 162,530,101	\$ 142,561,238	\$ -	\$ 12.6424	\$ 1,802,312	\$ (90,116)	\$ 1,712,196	\$ 22,328	\$ 1,734,524
2032	\$ 324,922,277	\$ 162,530,101	\$ 162,392,176	\$ -	\$ 12.6424	\$ 2,053,022	\$ (102,651)	\$ 1,950,371	\$ 25,683	\$ 1,976,054
2033	\$ 346,042,225	\$ 162,530,101	\$ 183,512,124	\$ -	\$ 12.6424	\$ 2,320,028	\$ (116,001)	\$ 2,204,026	\$ 29,256	\$ 2,233,282
2034	\$ 368,534,969	\$ 162,530,101	\$ 206,004,868	\$ -	\$ 12.6424	\$ 2,604,389	\$ (130,219)	\$ 2,474,170	\$ 33,060	\$ 2,507,230
2035	\$ 392,489,742	\$ 162,530,101	\$ 229,959,641	\$ -	\$ 12.6424	\$ 2,907,234	\$ (145,362)	\$ 2,761,873	\$ 37,113	\$ 2,798,985
2036	\$ 418,001,575	\$ 162,530,101	\$ 255,471,474	\$ -	\$ 12.6424	\$ 3,229,764	\$ (161,488)	\$ 3,068,276	\$ 41,428	\$ 3,109,704
2037	\$ 445,171,678	\$ 162,530,101	\$ 282,641,577	\$ -	\$ 12.6424	\$ 3,573,259	\$ (178,663)	\$ 3,394,596	\$ 46,024	\$ 3,440,620
2038	\$ 474,107,837	\$ 162,530,101	\$ 311,577,736	\$ -	\$ 12.6424	\$ 3,939,081	\$ (196,954)	\$ 3,742,126	\$ 50,919	\$ 3,793,045
2039	\$ 504,924,847	\$ 162,530,101	\$ 342,394,746	\$ -	\$ 12.6424	\$ 4,328,681	\$ (216,434)	\$ 4,112,246	\$ 56,132	\$ 4,168,378
2040	\$ 537,744,961	\$ 162,530,101	\$ 375,214,860	\$ -	\$ 12.6424	\$ 4,743,604	\$ (237,180)	\$ 4,506,424	\$ 61,684	\$ 4,568,108
2041	\$ 572,698,383	\$ 162,530,101	\$ 410,168,282	\$ -	\$ 12.6424	\$ 5,185,499	\$ (259,275)	\$ 4,926,224	\$ 67,596	\$ 4,993,820
2042	\$ 609,923,778	\$ 162,530,101	\$ 447,393,677	\$ -	\$ 12.6424	\$ 5,656,116	\$ (282,806)	\$ 5,373,310	\$ 73,893	\$ 5,447,203
2043	\$ 649,568,823	\$ 162,530,101	\$ 487,038,722	\$ -	\$ 12.6424	\$ 6,157,323	\$ (307,866)	\$ 5,849,457	\$ 80,600	\$ 5,930,056
2044	\$ 691,790,795	\$ 162,530,101	\$ 529,260,694	\$ -	\$ 12.6424	\$ 6,691,109	\$ (334,555)	\$ 6,356,553	\$ 87,742	\$ 6,444,295
2045	\$ 736,757,197	\$ 162,530,101	\$ 574,227,096	\$ -	\$ 12.6424	\$ 7,259,590	\$ (362,980)	\$ 6,896,611	\$ 95,348	\$ 6,991,959
2046	\$ 784,646,414	\$ 162,530,101	\$ 622,116,313	\$ -	\$ 12.6424	\$ 7,865,024	\$ (393,251)	\$ 7,471,772	\$ 103,449	\$ 7,575,222
2047	\$ 835,648,432	\$ 162,530,101	\$ 673,118,331	\$ -	\$ 12.6424	\$ 8,509,810	\$ (425,490)	\$ 8,084,319	\$ 112,077	\$ 8,196,396
2048	\$ 889,965,580	\$ 162,530,101	\$ 727,435,479	\$ -	\$ 12.6424	\$ 9,196,507	\$ (459,825)	\$ 8,736,682	\$ 121,265	\$ 8,857,947
2049	\$ 947,813,343	\$ 162,530,101	\$ 785,283,242	\$ -	\$ 12.6424	\$ 9,927,840	\$ (496,392)	\$ 9,431,448	\$ 131,050	\$ 9,562,498
2050	\$ 1,009,421,209	\$ 162,530,101	\$ 846,891,108	\$ -	\$ 12.6424	\$ 10,706,709	\$ (535,335)	\$ 10,171,374	\$ 141,472	\$ 10,312,846
2051	\$ 1,075,033,587	\$ 162,530,101	\$ 912,503,486	\$ -	\$ 12.6424	\$ 11,536,205	\$ (576,810)	\$ 10,959,395	\$ 152,571	\$ 11,111,966
2052	\$ 1,144,910,770	\$ 162,530,101	\$ 927,231,689	\$ 55,148,980	\$ 12.6424	\$ 11,722,405	\$ (586,120)	\$ 11,136,284	\$ 164,391	\$ 11,300,675
Total						\$ 138,962,169	\$ (6,948,108)	\$ 132,014,061	\$ 1,813,167	\$ 133,827,227

The following two tables show the impacts to taxing districts during the 30 year time frame of the urban renewal area.

FYE	Yamhill County Permanent	Yamhill County Extension Service Permanent	Yamhill County Soil & Water Permanent	City of Newberg Permanent	Tualatin Valley Fire & Rescue Permanent	Chehallem Park & Recreation Permanent
2023	\$ (53,418)	\$ (931)	\$ (734)	\$ (47,888)	\$ (31,610)	\$ (18,810)
2024	\$ (83,560)	\$ (1,456)	\$ (1,148)	\$ (74,910)	\$ (49,446)	\$ (29,424)
2025	\$ (115,248)	\$ (2,008)	\$ (1,583)	\$ (103,317)	\$ (68,196)	\$ (40,582)
2026	\$ (148,995)	\$ (2,596)	\$ (2,046)	\$ (133,571)	\$ (88,166)	\$ (52,465)
2027	\$ (184,937)	\$ (3,222)	\$ (2,540)	\$ (165,791)	\$ (109,434)	\$ (65,121)
2028	\$ (223,214)	\$ (3,888)	\$ (3,066)	\$ (200,106)	\$ (132,084)	\$ (78,599)
2029	\$ (263,979)	\$ (4,599)	\$ (3,626)	\$ (236,651)	\$ (156,206)	\$ (92,953)
2030	\$ (307,394)	\$ (5,355)	\$ (4,222)	\$ (275,572)	\$ (181,896)	\$ (108,241)
2031	\$ (353,631)	\$ (6,160)	\$ (4,857)	\$ (317,022)	\$ (209,256)	\$ (124,522)
2032	\$ (402,874)	\$ (7,018)	\$ (5,533)	\$ (361,167)	\$ (238,395)	\$ (141,862)
2033	\$ (455,317)	\$ (7,932)	\$ (6,253)	\$ (408,181)	\$ (269,428)	\$ (160,328)
2034	\$ (511,169)	\$ (8,905)	\$ (7,021)	\$ (458,251)	\$ (302,477)	\$ (179,995)
2035	\$ (570,651)	\$ (9,941)	\$ (7,837)	\$ (511,576)	\$ (337,675)	\$ (200,940)
2036	\$ (634,000)	\$ (11,044)	\$ (8,708)	\$ (568,366)	\$ (375,161)	\$ (223,247)
2037	\$ (701,467)	\$ (12,220)	\$ (9,634)	\$ (628,848)	\$ (415,083)	\$ (247,003)
2038	\$ (773,318)	\$ (13,471)	\$ (10,621)	\$ (693,262)	\$ (457,600)	\$ (272,304)
2039	\$ (849,840)	\$ (14,804)	\$ (11,672)	\$ (761,862)	\$ (502,881)	\$ (299,249)
2040	\$ (931,336)	\$ (16,224)	\$ (12,791)	\$ (834,921)	\$ (551,105)	\$ (327,946)
2041	\$ (1,018,130)	\$ (17,736)	\$ (13,983)	\$ (912,729)	\$ (602,464)	\$ (358,508)
2042	\$ (1,110,565)	\$ (19,346)	\$ (15,253)	\$ (995,595)	\$ (657,161)	\$ (391,057)
2043	\$ (1,209,008)	\$ (21,061)	\$ (16,605)	\$ (1,083,847)	\$ (715,414)	\$ (425,721)
2044	\$ (1,313,850)	\$ (22,887)	\$ (18,045)	\$ (1,177,835)	\$ (777,452)	\$ (462,638)
2045	\$ (1,425,506)	\$ (24,832)	\$ (19,578)	\$ (1,277,933)	\$ (843,524)	\$ (501,955)
2046	\$ (1,544,421)	\$ (26,904)	\$ (21,211)	\$ (1,384,537)	\$ (913,890)	\$ (543,828)
2047	\$ (1,671,064)	\$ (29,110)	\$ (22,951)	\$ (1,498,070)	\$ (988,829)	\$ (588,422)
2048	\$ (1,805,940)	\$ (31,459)	\$ (24,803)	\$ (1,618,983)	\$ (1,068,640)	\$ (635,915)
2049	\$ (1,949,582)	\$ (33,962)	\$ (26,776)	\$ (1,747,755)	\$ (1,153,638)	\$ (686,495)
2050	\$ (2,102,562)	\$ (36,627)	\$ (28,877)	\$ (1,884,897)	\$ (1,244,162)	\$ (740,363)
2051	\$ (2,265,485)	\$ (39,465)	\$ (31,115)	\$ (2,030,954)	\$ (1,340,569)	\$ (797,732)
2052	\$ (2,303,958)	\$ (40,135)	\$ (31,643)	\$ (2,065,445)	\$ (1,363,336)	\$ (811,279)
Total	\$ (27,284,419)	\$ (475,294)	\$ (374,731)	\$ (24,459,843)	\$ (16,145,178)	\$ (9,607,503)

FYE	Willamette Regional		Portland Community		Total All
	SD 291 Permanent	ESD Permanent	College Permanent		
2023	\$ (96,611)	\$ (6,149)	\$ (5,861)	\$ (262,011)	
2024	\$ (151,125)	\$ (9,619)	\$ (9,168)	\$ (409,853)	
2025	\$ (208,434)	\$ (13,266)	\$ (12,645)	\$ (565,279)	
2026	\$ (269,469)	\$ (17,151)	\$ (16,348)	\$ (730,807)	
2027	\$ (334,471)	\$ (21,288)	\$ (20,291)	\$ (907,095)	
2028	\$ (403,699)	\$ (25,694)	\$ (24,491)	\$ (1,094,841)	
2029	\$ (477,426)	\$ (30,387)	\$ (28,963)	\$ (1,294,790)	
2030	\$ (555,945)	\$ (35,385)	\$ (33,727)	\$ (1,507,737)	
2031	\$ (639,568)	\$ (40,707)	\$ (38,800)	\$ (1,734,524)	
2032	\$ (728,627)	\$ (46,375)	\$ (44,203)	\$ (1,976,054)	
2033	\$ (823,474)	\$ (52,412)	\$ (49,957)	\$ (2,233,282)	
2034	\$ (924,487)	\$ (58,841)	\$ (56,085)	\$ (2,507,230)	
2035	\$ (1,032,065)	\$ (65,689)	\$ (62,611)	\$ (2,798,985)	
2036	\$ (1,146,636)	\$ (72,981)	\$ (69,562)	\$ (3,109,704)	
2037	\$ (1,268,654)	\$ (80,747)	\$ (76,964)	\$ (3,440,620)	
2038	\$ (1,398,604)	\$ (89,018)	\$ (84,848)	\$ (3,793,045)	
2039	\$ (1,536,999)	\$ (97,826)	\$ (93,243)	\$ (4,168,378)	
2040	\$ (1,684,391)	\$ (107,208)	\$ (102,185)	\$ (4,568,108)	
2041	\$ (1,841,363)	\$ (117,198)	\$ (111,708)	\$ (4,993,820)	
2042	\$ (2,008,538)	\$ (127,839)	\$ (121,850)	\$ (5,447,203)	
2043	\$ (2,186,580)	\$ (139,171)	\$ (132,651)	\$ (5,930,056)	
2044	\$ (2,376,194)	\$ (151,239)	\$ (144,154)	\$ (6,444,295)	
2045	\$ (2,578,134)	\$ (164,092)	\$ (156,405)	\$ (6,991,959)	
2046	\$ (2,793,199)	\$ (177,781)	\$ (169,452)	\$ (7,575,222)	
2047	\$ (3,022,244)	\$ (192,359)	\$ (183,347)	\$ (8,196,396)	
2048	\$ (3,266,176)	\$ (207,885)	\$ (198,145)	\$ (8,857,947)	
2049	\$ (3,525,964)	\$ (224,419)	\$ (213,906)	\$ (9,562,498)	
2050	\$ (3,802,639)	\$ (242,029)	\$ (230,690)	\$ (10,312,846)	
2051	\$ (4,097,297)	\$ (260,783)	\$ (248,566)	\$ (11,111,966)	
2052	\$ (4,166,880)	\$ (265,212)	\$ (252,787)	\$ (11,300,675)	
Total	\$ (49,345,897)	\$ (3,140,752)	\$ (2,993,612)	\$ (133,827,227)	

This table shows the estimated tax increment revenues the year after termination of the urban renewal area, in FYE 2053. It shows the revenue from the original frozen base, from the increased value over the 30 year time period (excess value) and the total estimated property tax revenue from the area.

Taxing District	Type	Tax Rate	Tax Revenue in FYE 2053		
			From Frozen Base	From Excess Value	Total
General Government					
Yamhill County	Permanent	2.5775	\$ 418,922	\$ 2,723,902	\$ 3,142,824
Yamhill County Extension Service	Permanent	0.0449	\$ 7,297	\$ 47,450	\$ 54,747
Yamhill County Soil & Water	Permanent	0.0354	\$ 5,754	\$ 37,410	\$ 43,164
City of Newberg	Permanent	2.5750	\$ 375,553	\$ 2,441,914	\$ 2,817,467
Tualatin Valley Fire & Rescue	Permanent	1.5252	\$ 247,891	\$ 1,611,831	\$ 1,859,722
Chehalem Park & Recreation	Permanent	0.9076	\$ 147,513	\$ 959,152	\$ 1,106,665
<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>Gen. Govt.</i>	<i>7.6656</i>	<i>\$ 1,202,930</i>	<i>\$ 7,821,659</i>	<i>\$ 9,024,589</i>
Education					
SD 29J	Permanent	4.6616	\$ 757,650	\$ 4,926,378	\$ 5,684,028
Willamette Regional ESD	Permanent	0.2967	\$ 48,222	\$ 313,552	\$ 361,774
Portland Community College	Permanent	0.2828	\$ 45,963	\$ 298,863	\$ 344,826
<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>Education</i>	<i>5.2411</i>	<i>\$ 851,835</i>	<i>\$ 5,538,793</i>	<i>\$ 6,390,628</i>
Total		12.9067	\$ 2,054,765	\$ 13,360,452	\$ 15,415,217