

# Ad Hoc Urban Renewal Citizens Advisory Committee January 25, 2021 – 5:30 PM Newberg City Hall 414 E First Street (teleconference meeting) <u>https://zoom.us/j/94522904682</u>

Or join by phone: Dial (for higher quality, dial a number based on your current location): US: +1 253 215 8782 or +1 346 248 7799 or +1 669 900 6833 or +1 301 715 8592 or +1 312 626 6799 or +1 929 205 6099 Webinar ID: 945 2290 4682

Email any comments to <a href="mailto:doug.rux@newbergoregon.gov">doug.rux@newbergoregon.gov</a>

- I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER
- II. ROLL CALL

# III. CONSENT CALENDAR

III.A. Ad Hoc Urban Renewal Citizens Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes November 9, 202 and November 23, 2020

# IV. NEW BUSINESS

IV.A. Prioritization of project list to match financial capacity

# V. PUBLIC COMMENTS

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

# VI. ITEMS FROM STAFF

# VII. ITEMS FROM COMMITTEE MEMBERS

VIII. 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 November 9, 2020 5:30 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 Curt Walker the called meeting to order at 5:31 pm

# **ROLL CALL**

Members Present:	John Bridges, Chair
	Stephanie Findley
	Molly Olson
	Angel Aguiar
	Don Clements
	Joe Morelock
	Loni Parrish
	Cassandra Ulven
Members Absent:	Rick Rogers, excused
	Francisco Stoller, Vice Chair
	Don Griswold
	Josh Duder
Staff Present:	Doug Rux, Community Development Director
	Brett Musick, Senior Engineer
	Matt Zook, Finance Director
	Shannon Buckmaster, Economic Health Manager
Consultant Present:	Elaine Howard

## **CONSENT CALENDAR:**

Approval of the June 29, 2020 Ad Hoc Urban renewal Citizens Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes

**MOTION**: Member Ulven and Member Aguiar moved to approve the June 29, 2020 Ad Hoc Urban renewal Citizens Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes with noted changes, Motion carried 8/0

Chair Bridges noted CDD Rux is going to cover the first three bullets under the new updates and then he will cover the fourth one. We are all going to talk about the prioritization of the project list. The goal isn't to get through the prioritization, but to start the dialogue and later this month have a further revision so we can cut down the project list.

#### **NEW BUSINESS:**

## Update on City Council review of Feasibility Study

CDD Rux noted the City Council reviewed the Urban Renewal Feasibility Study that went before them on July 20<sup>th</sup>. They accepted the report by resolution that took us to the next step in the process which was to form an Urban Renewal Agency. We took that material to Council on August 17<sup>th</sup> which they held their public hearing and created an Urban Renewal Agency. We now have a section in our Municipal Code related to the Urban Renewal Agency. That ordinance went into effect on September 16<sup>th</sup>. There will be some things I have to do with the Agency on some policies and

procedures before the first Urban Renewal Agency meeting. CDD Rux noted congratulations to the Committee on all the hard work that was done to help Council consider and make their decisions.

# Update on sale of industrial parcel:

CDD Rux updated the Committee on the sale of the Mill Site which sold on September 17<sup>th</sup>, 2020. The new owner is Commercial Development Company (CDC) and are out of St. Louis, Missouri. They purchased around 220 acres of land from West Rock. This was officially announced in the press release on September 28<sup>th</sup>. They have identified that they will be dismantling the Mill Site. It will take some time to tear down the facility. I'll be talking with them about timelines because it plays directly into formation of our Urban Renewal Plan and Report. We will give the Committee an update at our meeting on November 23<sup>rd</sup>, where we're at and how it will play into our timeline. Their timeline will play into the City's timeline of actually creating a finalizing an Urban Renewal Plan and Report. We have also been in conversations with the County Assessor, talking about timelines and what can be on the tax rolls. If everything is gone by December 31<sup>st</sup> 2021 then it does not show up on the next November bill. I still have more questions for the County Assessor to see if there's any nuances to that particular process.

CDD Rux noted what is positive is that CDC is going to redevelop the Mill Site. The Urban Renewal Program that we've been talking about timing wise is timed well when we're talking about infrastructure projects, new development, timing and leveraging will be very important.

Chair Bridges asked how much of the Mill Site did West Rock retain. CDD Rux responded West Rock owns about 4 acres. Commercial Development Company was the only buyer. Chair Bridges noted he saw a legal description that there's some exceptions and asked if that is the 4 acres that has come up? CDD Rux responded yes, it is down on the southeast corner of the Mill Site which is within the Urban Growth Boundary. Chair Bridges asked what they are planning on doing with that site and CDD Rux could not comment on that right now.

Member Olson asked how much impact on the net value is that going to be, is it benign or average impact. CDD Rux responded benign impact. He had a conversation with the County Assessor and they just certified the tax roll in October. The County Assessor did indicate that the value of the equipment significantly went down this tax year and that is because they removed a lot of equipment off the Mill Site.

# Review of financial data and recommendation on AV growth rate

Elaine Howard reviewed the Exhibit 1: Value History, Yamhill County and City of Newberg 2007 to 2020. She noted when going through an Urban Renewal process we have to pick the growth rate for the financial analysis. The financial scenarios we were given were four different assessed value potential growth rates to consider. The chart shows the historic growth rates have been both in Yamhill County and in the City of Newberg. The assessed value is the one we want to look at. The County as a whole from 2007 to 2020 the assessed value increase was about 4.3% and for the City of Newberg it is 4.8%.

Chair Bridges asked about the big jump in 2018.

Elaine responded there were a couple things that happened. They changed their actual system for tracking assessed value within the County, which changed how their system worked. That was a jump in real market value. In looking at the assessed value it didn't have that kind of fluctuation, it's the assessed value where we get the division of tax revenues. She noted it's a mechanical issue but irrelevant in terms of decisions we're making, we're dealing with assessed value not real market value.

Elaine continued with review of the Exhibit 2: Value history as percent of 2007 value, Yamhill County and City of Newberg 2007 to 2020. This graph shows the differences in the real market value and assessed values over time. The dotted line is the assessed value and it gives you an idea of the variances between assessed values and real market values in Oregon.

Elaine continued with review of the Exhibit 3: Financial Capacity Summary Based on Potential Assessed Value Growth Rate Assumptions, Proposed Newberg URA. She noted with guidance from Newberg staff as part of the feasibility study we looked at four different potential scenarios for how the assessed value growth rate might occur within the area. With those we made some projections on what the maximum indebtedness might be over a 30 year time frame. The most

important thing for us is the capacity in 2020 dollars. When looking at projects and the total value of the cost of projects that we can include within the plan, knowing that overtime those will increase due to cost of inflation. Nick and I have talked with City staff and the City Finance Director about these assessed value growth scenarios. The 4% growth is very conservative, it is less than the City's growth on its own over time. 5% is above the City's growth and 6% is more aggressive and given the multitude of vacant parcels and potential development within the area the 6% on the technical side feels comfortable as a assessed value growth rate, where 7% feels a little high. Looking at the first row it says the amount of new development exception assessed value would have to come on the property tax rolls every year to be able to meet the growth scenarios. Over a 30 year time frame we know that every year is not going to be the same amount, but over time the percent growth is going to average out. The 4% growth scenario says how you would get \$1.7 million dollars of growth which the City is achieving that already. The 5% scenario is \$4.1 million dollars, the 6% scenario, \$7.4 million dollars and the 7% scenario is \$11.7 million dollars. She noted Nick from Tiberias who does our financial work has suggested that we use the 6% scenario. We have gone over that with the City Finance Director and CDD Rux and both are comfortable with that scenario. When we pick a scenario it establishes for us what that maximum indebtedness is and establishes capacity. It doesn't mean that it is guaranteed that kind of growth will happen, if this kind of growth doesn't happen, it means that the actual maximum indebtedness could not be reached within that time frame and the amount of projects would not be done.

Elaine noted we feel comfortable going to a 6% growth scenario if the Mill Site gets developed and the first step in that happening now that it has been sold and demolition has started. There is a lot of infrastructure that has to be done to allow that site to be developed correctly. What we are wanting from the Committee is if you have any questions and if anyone is uncomfortable using the 6% scenario. Does the Committee want to make a recommendation that you support the 6% scenario and are comfortable with it?

CDD Rux noted we have had a series of conversations internally on the growth rate. As we have identified in the feasibility study, we have identified projects to occur within the Downtown area, Riverfront area and the large project area at the Mill Site. We would like feedback from the Committee members about what you think the appropriate growth rate should be, because that's going to drive our second part of our conversation this evening which is to look at the infrastructure list and what projects we think would be viable or not.

Elaine noted as we start putting reality into a plan, saying what projects need to be funded and at what timeline those numbers are going to shift because if you borrow money earlier, you might have more capacity. We will work towards the number of whatever growth rate we have for capacity. As Nick starts developing a finance plan those numbers might shift, and we will come back to talk through them with the Committee.

Member Aguiar noted on the maximum indebtedness over the life of these projects, what would be the worst case scenario be if we are projecting 6% growth rate and we end close to 3% or 4%.

Elaine noted the worst case scenario is that you do not get all the projects done. You will not financially get yourself in trouble, because you won't be able to get a loan or bond unless you have a certain debt service coverage ratio for the area that protects the bondholders. When you go into debt as an Urban Renewal Agency and get a bond, the amount of money you're going to get is pretty conservative and is based on 1.5% debt ratio.

Member Olson noted the other end of the spectrum if we choose 6% and it goes higher to 8% growth rate, do we limit ourselves by picking 6% have the ability to borrow more?

Elaine noted you limit yourself by picking 6% because the maximum indebtedness is your limit. If it takes a shorter amount of time to reach the maximum indebtedness you're able to terminate. If the projects end sooner they are actually cheaper overall financially and able to close down your District earlier.

Member Olson noted 8% is not an option, but is a thought experiment. I'm not suggesting that no one would loan us more than 6%. It doesn't limit us on the low side because were working with responsible bond companies who won't let us get in over our heads. What is the harm?

Elaine responded the harm is public expectations. If you're saying we're going to do this list of projects with Urban Renewal funds and were going to get xx amount of money and it is not realistic you lose some credibility with the public.

Member Olson asked if were already doing almost 5%, by going with the 6% growth we only expect 1% growth from the Mill Site project.

Elaine noted it's 1% but a different way to look at that is a difference between \$1.7 million dollars of growth a year to \$7.4 million. It maybe only 1% but it is a lot of development. It feels small when you look at 5% to 6% but when you look at the actual numbers if the assessed value growth is less than the real market value, the real market value is higher than the amount of growth.

Member Ulven noted even though right now the average for Newberg and Yamhill County is upwards of 4% in the Urban Renewal Area it might be lower, that might be a bigger gap of improvement over all, is that fair?

Elaine noted it is fair, it would be difficult to go back and isolate out that particular area. She noted a lot of the growth is the new housing in residential areas and downtown area that helps provide the increase. CDD Rux provided us with a list of projects within the Urban Renewal Area and it was substantial new development and redevelopment projects.

CDD Rux commented that early on in this process he had to go through the exercise of where there was development. He went through all his notes from people who have inquired about doing different development activities in the downtown area. They range from inquiries of purchasing a piece of property, tearing down a house to put up three new houses, an inquiry on the vacant lot on First Street to put in a two or three story building or ground floor commercial with apartments above. He noted he walked through block by block in the downtown area based on notes from the last five years of inquires and did a similar exercise in the Riverfront Area outside the Mill Site. He noted we have an apartment project occurring on River Street that's currently under construction, and residential developments occurring north and south of the Bypass off of Weatherly Way. He noted we tried to capture all of that information and forwarded it to Nick when he was doing the feasibility analysis.

Elaine noted what Member Ulven was saying if you go to 7% or 8% and you don't have a fixed time limit on your plan and you are unable to achieve that percentage you keep going on until you hit it. For example it's at 7% and we did estimates for 30 years and at year 25, they do an analysis and say was going to take you another 15 years to get to your maximum density, the impact is on those taxing districts because they wait while you're trying to reach a maximum indebtedness that isn't achievable.

Chair Bridges noted the maximum length is 30 years and my recollection is what we're going to recommend.

Elaine noted the time frame is not a requirement of the statute. There are plans that have set time frames in them. The only requirement of the statute is the maximum indebtedness. There are cities that have recently established the time frame or established reviews let's say 20 years of financial review that says we're going to re-evaluate and see where we are and let everyone know. Elaine noted the time frame that we've talked about at this point is more advisory. At some point you as a Committee might tell us you wanted it to be more than advisory, you want it to be a component of the plan or what we would talk to the Urban Renewal Agency and City Council about, but it's not a required statutory component.

Chair Bridges noted we need a hard deadline so all affected agencies can know what they are planning for and we want them to be our partners. As long as our growth performance supports it, you don't need to plan for anything more challenging.

Member Olson agreed and that is the protection for the people sharing taxes.

Member Clements noted he agrees with Chair Bridges and would not be opposed to using the 5% rather than the 6% but definitely a time limit needs to be put in the plan.

Chair Bridges asked along the lines of what the technical group rationale is, why not 6.5%.

Elaine responded you could go with 6.5%. The amount of growth that you would think it would be let's say between 7.4% and 11.7%, you could give us a direction that you think it could be higher than that. The reality is who gets hurt by going too high if you set a time frame that's hard and fast like 30 years, the taxing districts don't get hurt. Then it's the expectations of what projects can get done or cannot get done within the area. Over the 30 years we do some kind of financial update analysis every 10 years to see where you are and how projects have changed. You could track that going ahead, you have a huge amount of development capacity in Newberg and we don't really know what that number is.

We're making an assumption that it is going to be at least 1% higher than what is now at 4.8%. In response to Chair Bridges we could go a little higher.

Chair Bridges noted we're going to recommend the number and ultimately it generates a capacity. But we look at all these projects not knowing what we are budgeted for. We need to know what the budget is as we start to parse through these projects.

Elaine noted that is what doing this step is and whatever we decide on we will set your budget.

Chair Bridges noted we need a study that identifies what leverages future development, what types of things generate better return on investment, than we start prioritizing those things and maybe we could justify a capacity of \$60 million dollars.

Elaine responded noting there isn't a study, but there are examples across the State of successful Urban Renewal Areas where they've done certain things to cause development to occur. You have two different kinds of areas in your Urban Renewal Area which will be different. The Riverfront Area is clearly providing the infrastructure that's going to be necessary to help facilitate that development will be key. When looking at projects make sure that the infrastructure goes in to help make that development occur, this is really important. The Downtown Area is going to be different kinds of things to help facilitate that infill development, it may be developer assistance or could be assistance with providing elevators to upper floors in buildings to get those upper floors in use. In response to Chair Bridges question I wish I could point you to something that said if you invest in infrastructure, you're going to get X to X dollar leverage ratio. I do know that if you help provide infrastructure for your Riverfront Area, you're going to get huge return on investment.

Member Olson noted the concern is you do a lot of work on 6% given the amount of land we have and the fact that it is sold, we look at the projects and what is really needed is \$60 million dollars but we have stopped ourselves at \$53.7 million dollars. We have a good understanding of this now and the answer is between 5% and 7% based on what Chair Bridges said. She asked if CDD Rux might have a list of future projects that would be required for development we could sort through.

CDD Rux noted he has been working in urban areas that are both downtown and in industrial. Starting with the industrial from the development community. I have been asked what can you do to assist us with the public infrastructure, roads, sewer, and water are three big ones. Storm treatment regulations is mostly on site, we're not talking about building a regional storm water facility. It's mostly the transportation sewer and water. When we get to the numbers we are talking about roughly \$48 million dollars capital infrastructure cost in 2020 dollar values. That \$48 Million dollars in the Riverfront Area is almost 6% at the capacity rate. Then we move to the Downtown Area where there is not as much infrastructure but there is selected upsizing of water and sewer lines to accommodate the additional density that is going in.

CDD Rux noted we then get into doing work on buildings. For example in Salem downtown is we were investing on repurposing upper floors that sat vacant for decades. That was a lot of elevators, fire suppression systems, windows, venting, and ingress/egress components. In Tualatin we built a new downtown, very different than doing something industrial, there was not much in the way of transportation, sewer, water and storm systems. Each one was a little different. When you go back to the list of what we identified in the feasibility it study was right around \$117 million dollars' of projects. We know based on four scenarios that we originally analyzed is you're not going to generate that much revenue in order to do all those projects. The discussion is what projects do you just not do or leave up to the developers, what projects you want to fund in whole in order to attract that investment or fund a proportion of.

CDD Rux gave everyone a thought process starting with downtown, the biggest issue is the road diet. That is to create a pedestrian friendly walkable downtown, wide sidewalks, and eliminate one travel lane. It is a little over \$9 million dollars for First Street and several million dollars for Hancock Street. With this additional growth in the downtown area we're going to need parking, do we do a parking garage? The Riverfront Area there is some key projects to make development feasible, one is S River Street from E First Street all the way to E Fourteenth Street one of the main ways in and out, then S College Street is another. We have a railroad line and we know from the conversations with ODOT Rail, is that both of these rail crossings are going to have to have signals put in and those are very costly. We need to have S Blaine Street extended from E Ninth Street around to S College Street. If we don't have S Blaine Street and S River Street in place then the trip distribution doesn't work and the whole Riverfront plan doesn't work. That is part of the Transportation Planning

Rule Analysis. There are some costs that are associated with the esplanade. When we were putting together the Riverfront Plan the question and the component of the improvement is the asset to the whole walkability open space of the Riverfront and who funds that because we're talking about a 12 foot wide path that runs hundreds of feet. The other big infrastructure piece is the Bluff Road, how does the road work to get from S River Street back to NE Dog Ridge. Those are your primary transportation links in order to make the Riverfront Area work. The next level is park and trail improvements. Interior roads, which impart are driven by the development pattern. Developer may want large lots or smaller lots, we are doing the Economic Opportunities Analysis indicates that we need some lots that are smaller than 5 acres in size, lots 5 to 25, several 25 to 50 and one in the 50 acre and above. I look at these projects and think them through from the developer's perspective. Sometimes the developer is looking for assistance in order to get that multimillion dollar building and the multimillion dollar equipment that goes into that building and to create jobs.

Elaine noted back to Member Olson's question, it is doable if we go 6% for now and that gives us a capacity of 53.7%. We go through the project exercise and we find there is capacity for a little bigger than 6%, we go back in and adjust. She noted this is a very reasonable approach and thoughtful process.

# Begin prioritization of project list to match financial capacity

CDD Rux noted on the value of projects, the first sheet gives the summary of the Downtown and the Riverfront area. In the Downtown Area we've identified the potential of almost \$59 million worth of projects. Those are broken out, the top is the public infrastructure, transportation infrastructure, followed by the other infrastructure on the water, wastewater and storm. There is the category of signage, wayfinding north and south connections, trolley and parking came in at about \$8.5 million. Pedestrian furniture, trash cans which gets better destiny in walkability \$175 thousand. The building façade program is approximately \$.5 million. There is the Second Street utility undergrounding and part of the Downtown Plan is to get additional rooftops. We were looking at the area from River Street to Grant Street for redevelopment and infill opportunities, the more rooftops support the downtown business, is a little over \$1.8 million.

CDD Rux noted in the Riverfront Area the transportation pieces are at \$33 million. Water, wastewater and storm is almost \$14 million. The trails are a little over \$1.8 million. The Riverfront Project came to almost \$49 million and we also did the 10% on the administration charge, we estimated at \$9.9 million over 30 years and that's where you get to the range of \$116 million to \$117.5 million and some of that variability comes if we did a parking garage or not.

CDD Rux noted details on the feasibility study. The transportation infrastructure side, the Hancock Street road diet was just under \$1.1 million dollars which is in 2020 values. We looked at what might be SDC eligible and what might be Grant resources or other resources like a local improvement district LID. First Street road diet from the west end of the couplet down to the east end of the couplet is a little over \$9.9 million dollars. He noted individual streets block by block analysis in the Downtown Area based on the geography originally established. Second Street from Harrison to River Street \$1 million, River Street from First Street to Sheridan Street etc. He noted most of the blocks are on the transportation side talking about sidewalk improvements, pedestrian sidewalk enhancement. We have many areas downtown which are four foot wide sidewalks that don't meet ADA compliance. The whole intent downtown as we have these curb tight sidewalks, not planter strips and would have tree wells. We start to identify developers as a potential part of the funding. Then you get down to Sheridan Street at the railroad tracks we have the Sidewalk Grant Program which may be another potential finding source. There are ADA ramps on Blaine Street we have identified and the potential alternative funding source which is the ODOT Safe Routes to school program.

Chair Bridges commented he could not find note 2 and on note 1 the project is not in a current City of Newberg infrastructure master plan and asked why we would have a project on our list if it is already in a master plan.

CDD Rux noted this goes back to when we put together the feasibility study. We started with all of the Master Plans that we have in the City for Transportation to Water and Stormwater. Then looked at the components of the Master Plans that were in the boundary for the overall Urban Renewal Area. The items outside the Master Plans were sidewalk issues and ADA ramp issues in the Downtown Area which you don't find in the Master Plans. We were capturing all of the potential projects for the Committee to consider, and what we've identified as the infrastructure need within the downtown comprehensively. CDD noted that note 1 is not currently in the City of Newberg infrastructure Master Plan and note 2 is projects within the 2016 Transportation System Plan which provides no added capacity.

CDD Rux noted there are a variety of wastewater projects we have identified that are SDC eligible. Brett put together the percentage of these projects that would be eligible for SDC's. For example S River Street \$2.9 million dollars, 12% of that project cost could be paid by SDC's. Then we get to the infiltration projects you can see project cost and what would be SDC eligible. For example project number three is \$239,000 and half of that could be paid for by SDC's so you wouldn't need Urban Renewal funds to fully pay for that.

CDD Rux noted on the water projects downtown you see the project that is M1, we could always promote Brett up to see where these are at. He noted \$629,000 project and 34% is SDC Eligible where other projects are not SDC eligible. There is the storm water project on S Blaine Street where much of the downtown is collected into that line down S Blaine Street which we have already done some of that project. Brett broke this out for what's remaining to be done which is a little over \$900,000 and 5% of that is eligible to be paid for by SDC's.

CDD Rux noted we had the signage and wayfinding which comes out of the Downtown Improvement Plan. To Chair Bridges comment about this not being in the City Infrastructure Plan, signage is not in the City Infrastructure Plan but is a part of the Downtown Plan on how we move people around to get to different businesses in this pedestrian oriented environment. We had gateway signage in the east and west end of the couplet that would be in the Urban Renewal Area. The north-south connections is a refinement study of how the neighborhoods are to be able to get that multi-modal system and able to walk to bring them into the Downtown Area. We have the Trolley Feasibility Study that was a little under \$88,000.

CDD Rux noted we have different iterations of parking. There's parking data collection that happens on a regular basis, could that be paid for out of Urban Renewal or is it something that the General Fund pays for. Should signage come out of Urban Renew or out of the maintenance fund. Business Outreach is that a function of Urban Renewal or is it something that is another fund within the City. Engineering worked up numbers for the improvements on potential surface parking lot projects. Parking lots of around 25 spaces cost a little over \$.5 million dollars. He noted the big one is the Second Street public lot which is currently a surface lot and we have been talking about for a few years, could that become a parking structure in the future? Parking garages are much more expensive to build then surface parking lot. We looked at some different alternatives of a 2 or 3 level parking garage.

CDD Rux noted he is going to need some feedback for the Committee of what you think is important to leverage new development within the Downtown Area and meet the intent of the Downtown Plan. At the end of this meeting he will take the spread sheet adding another column for feedback from the Committee. You're homework exercise will be on the right hand column where you can put your initials to identify a project you think we should consider or a project that should be fully or partially fund. Once they are returned I will see what everyone's thinking and we will funnel it down to a smaller list of potential projects given the value on how you leverage those projects to attract new investment.

Member Olson noted she is familiar with the Downtown Improvement Plan and would not have a problem going through and prioritizing. As we look at the water and storm water, I don't have a criteria for saying this unlocks development like this.

CDD Rux noted this is the first cut and is not asking you to know all of the details but trying to get a feeling of what you think is important. He noted there are maps for all these projects if you go back to the feasibility study. In the first two meeting we are not going to resolve projects, it is going to take us probably three meetings to work through. What you think might be the right projects to consider under the auspices of your thinking of a growth rate around 6%, or 6.5% as was talked about.

Member Olson asked when making a decision do the storm water and water projects downtown unlock development potential, whereas a sidewalk improvement is a livability improvement, but not necessarily a development improvement.

CDD Rux noted downtown sewer and water projects unlock development potential. If you have a site that has been asphalt for decades and we say you need to go 250 feet down the street with a new water line, then you need to go another 170 feet down another street to tie onto an 8 inch line that is now the developers cost and the developer says we can't make the project pencil out. It is similar with sewer lines, the length of that pipe they need to put in because we have undersized infrastructure downtown. He noted for example when driving down First Street you see a vacant asphalt lot sitting there and wonder why nothing has happened with it. It's because they've got this long run of infrastructure that

developers have to upgrade in order to make it happen and they always ask what the City can do to assist so we can build a two story building, commercial on the ground floor and residential on the second floor.

Chair Bridges had Doug clarify what he wants on the spread sheet.

CDD Rux noted he will have columns that say fund, partially fund etc. He is looking for the Committee to give their first gut feelings before we get down to detail. He noted he will do the same exercise for the Riverfront area.

Chair Bridges asked if we can have those answers driven by what we think is going to generate more development like a parking garage, noting by the fact that McMinnville parking garage is full of homeless people and has all kinds of drug activity in it. Is it ok to share that opinion or should I put in an email.

CDD Rux noted he will set the framework for this homework exercise.

Member Ulven suggest having someone from staff put the spreadsheet questions into survey monkey so members might be able to put some context into where their reservations are and why they think it's going to be something that invites investment, then you can see it more visually with everyone's contributions.

CDD Rux went through the list on the Riverfront Project. In the Riverfront there are a wide variety of projects, we will start with transportation. Blaine Street extension from E Ninth Street to S College Street, this road would parallel the railroad line. Rogers Landing Road extension, the steep curvy road that goes down to Rogers Landing, we can be reconstructing that to have better access into Rogers Landing. College Street improvements from E Ninth Street to E Fourteenth Street, just on the north side of the Bypass which has one roadway cross section on the southside of the Bypass which has a different roadway cross section to accommodate the pedestrian nature because of the mix use and commercial node we're trying to create down there. That project is about \$3 million dollars. There is Riverfront Street improvements from E First Street to the Bypass and stops about E Ninth Street and is about \$3.6 million dollars. Looking at what is SDC eligible, 35% of it is and it could also be partially contributed by the developer. He noted there is no developable land until you get to S College Street to S Blaine Street, it runs alone the edge of Ewing Young Park. We have River Street from the Bypass to Rogers Landing Road, another project is Wynooski Street and 61% of that project is eligible for SDC's. Remember where a project is eligible for SDC's, we have a 5 year Capital Improvement Program and a 30 year Urban Renewal timeline. It would take engineering eventually to go back and plug projects in to figure out when they would have enough money for SDC's in order to match that if there's any Urban Renewal money that goes into a project. We've got E Ninth Street sidewalks from S Blaine Street to S River Street, this was part of that walkability and ADA accessibility issue. E Ninth Street south to the Bypass is an area that has not seen a lot of attention from the City for a number of decades. Missing sidewalks, narrow sidewalks, don't meet ADA from E Fourteenth Street to S College Street to River Street. We have a sidewalk project on S River Street to Wynooski on E Eleventh. We have E Ninth Street Bike Boulevard from S Blaine Street to S River Street, E Eleventh Street Bike Boulevard that goes east of S River Street. E Ninth Street Sidewalks S Blaine to E Charles Street and the E Ninth Street connection from S Pacific to Wynooski where there is a missing section of roadway undeveloped parcel of land, so if you're thinking about if you did an infrastructure does that leverage to bring in new development.

CDD Rux continued noting S Mill Place extension is another one that connects up into the E Ninth Street connection. The rail crossing improvements they are over \$400,000 each and ODOT has made it clear that if development occurs somebody's going to have to pay for that. Example if somebody is building a 40,000 square foot industrial building and they have to do an additional \$400,000 on a rail crossing, will that project happen. We looked into that situation for those rail crossings about doing a cost recover agreement, so development would occur north or south of the Bypass.

CDD Rux noted there is industrial streets on the main Mill Site and in the Master Plan tries to grid the Mill Site off. It will depend if they are looking at a number of smaller parcels rather than a couple of big parcels and whether you will need internal roads or not. He will be having conversations with the new owner to try to get a better understanding of what their development scenario will be because it plays into potential projects. There's some north, south, east and west roads basically on the industrial portion and mixed employment portion.

CDD Rux noted the need for more curb ramps on E Ninth Street. Then there is the trail component that was in the Riverfront Plan. Trail connection to Ewing Young Park, Hess Creek Trail, River Street to S College Street a multi-use

trail and Esplanade multi-use trail. The Esplanade has different segments from the cul-de-sac bulb on NE Waterfront Street all the way to the Waterline Bridge. The trail is about \$1.8 million dollars.

CDD Rux continued with water. He noted in the Riverfront Area there's a main water line. You go back to the feasibility study, you can see the map that shows where the water line goes. That is the main line that everything else T's off of, developers would pay to connect to the main line. That is about \$3.7 million dollars. Wastwater is a little more complicated because there's different basins in the Riverfront Area and the feasibility study there's some drawings. There are a variety of projects that come up to \$4.8 million dollars. One is the Riverfront lift station and 91% of that is SDC eligible, do we have enough SDC's within the 30 year window or would we have those SDC if Urban Renewal was a portion of the cost to build that lift station. The other big one is a force main. Similar type of system is the Storm, how to get the storm basin tides to the wastewater basins. Storm is a little over \$5 million dollars and Wastewater is similar. There is \$49 million dollars' worth of infrastructure there.

CDD Rux noted back to the question earlier that was asked about what leverage is. It's those main transportation corridors to be able to get goods and services and employees in and out of the Riverfront Area. One of the things that leverages attracting that new businesses to be able to come in and redevelop at the Mill site.

Brett noted thinking of transportation projects, we wouldn't want transportation projects unless we're doing the utility projects associated with it. We don't want to have a road project and later come in and do the water, wastewater, stormwater and those elements later.

Member Morelock noted the challenge in prioritizing these projects is that they are all very intertwined, I don't believe you have all the money you need to do all these projects in 2020 dollars. Part of this is we go through and prioritize these projects. I know there will be some frustration when trying to prioritizing these projects and that it doesn't come out the way we expect because they're all these things that we as non-experts don't have any idea about how they all mix together. When I look at this list of \$53 million dollars to \$57 million dollars for what we put together is really a drop in the bucket, because if you look over the course of time between 1% and 6% on all project costs, there's going to be something we're reaching for and never quite achieving.

CDD Rux noted when he has worked on industrial Urban Renewal Areas it's really big is those two primary transportation corridors in the infrastructure underneath the roads which helps leverage to attract those businesses and that investment. An example of some industrial in the Riverfront Area, there's about 3.7 acres of land that we've identified to be high-density residential housing which can accommodate about 65 dwelling units. I talked to a potential developer about that site and one of his first questions was is there any help to pay for the frontage improvements for the road, water, wastewater and multi-use trail frontage. My response was no that we are looking at an Urban Renewal Plan and that might possibility, but no guarantee. This is what the developer was asking what could the City do to help?

Member Olson noted instead of having all the water projects together and no way of segregating them out and it's important to do the high-density residential, what infrastructure projects must you have in order to do that 50 acres industrial. They're all lumped together is there any way to distinguish?

Brett noted in the Riverfront Area it's a little complicated because water lines and wastewater lines are estimated along the roadways of serving those basins where is it anticipated to go. The wastewater is broken out a little better because it come from the Mater Plan. He suggested to refer to the feasibility study maps that show the basins would be helpful to identify which water projects that serve the different developments in the high density areas you're referring to.

Member Olson noted to get to a plan you need to know what you're going to do.

CDD Rux noted this is always the hard part, \$117 million dollars' worth of potential projects, if you went with 6% you have a little over \$53 million dollars in 2020 you're not even halfway there and they're going to be winners and losers. What projects would be the best opportunity to attract investment, those new buildings and equipment in the Riverfront Area. What it takes in the Downtown Area to address those infrastructure deficiencies to do those infill projects.

Member Parish asked is there a way to show things that are shovel ready that we could do without having to have a ton of infrastructure done? She noted there could be some simple things that we could do to show the public that we're actually making a difference, because the public is not going to notice the water systems and those sort of things. For example if

we tackle First Street improvement, that would be huge and then try to get work done towards the Mill to get more people here.

Member Olson noted a highly visible project would be parking lots, they don't inspire development but they inspire confidence in the public.

Elaine noted she has done these Urban Renewal presentations all over the State and when I can show pictures of beautiful buildings that have been renovated or a public square full of people is what gets people excited. We all know that we have to put the infrastructure into make development happen. To get your Community excited about the potential of what Urban Renew can do for them, sometimes you have to do some of those projects that are Community driven and visual. The right projects will make the Community support your ability to use millions of dollars on infrastructure because they've gotten something out of it.

Chair Bridges noted something not on the list but for decades people have wanted public accessible restrooms.

Elaine added you tell me what the top 10 projects are and I would look at that and tell you if you are wrong.

Chair Bridges noted we have all these Master Plans on the list and we know we have to cut at least half, we should get the public input first. He noted because we're constrained right now with COVID-19, this is something the City Council could point out to the Community and say that this is a citizen driven effort with input first, without it being clouded by staff giving direction. Then we can have staff direction come as a part of the process.

Member Morelock noted it's going to be hard for us to agree because it's important to remember that there is some expertise and planning going into this. For example I wouldn't do parking and would rather look at trolleys. We're going to disagree with those things only because we are all different.

CDD Rux noted this is a different process than what we did on the long-range facilities plan. If we could all be face-to-face, I would have taken a different approach.

# **PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

None

## **ITEMS FROM COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

None

Chair Bridges noted we'll go through the process with all of our different perspectives which will be valued. He noted my first filter is does it affect out constituency or is it going to drive development, economic opportunity and economic activity. The projects that aren't attractive like underground water and sewer lines can in fact to that. Let's go through the process, everyone share their perspective and then figure out how to get it into a data so we can all learn about everyone else's perspective.

# ADJOURNMENT

Chair Bridges adjourned meeting at 7:07 pm

# APPROVED BY THE AD HOC URBAN RENEWAL CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE this JANUARY 25, 2021

John Bridges, UR CAC Chair

Doug Rux, Recording Secretary

# AD HOC URBAN RENEWAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE Meeting Minutes November 23, 2020 5:30 PM NEWBERG CITY HALL Meeting held electronically due to COVID 10 nondemic

# 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 Curt Walker the called meeting to order at 5:35 pm

# **ROLL CALL**

Members Present:	John Bridges, Chair
	Francisco Stoller, Vice Chair
	Stephanie Findley
	Molly Olson
	Don Clements
	Joe Morelock
	Josh Duder
	Cassandra Ulven
Members Absent:	Rick Rogers, excused
	Angel Aguiar
	Loni Parrish
Staff Present:	Doug Rux, Community Development Director
	Kaaren Hofmann, City Engineer Shannon Buckmaster, Economic Health Manager
a 1 b	

Consultant Present: Elaine Howard

## **NEW BUSINESS:**

## Prioritization of project list to match financial capacity:

CDD Rux noted he sent out a spreadsheet looking for initial feedback on projects, which should or should not be a priority and if a priority should it be fully or partially funded. He received more information and noted he sent out an updated spreadsheet. He noted there is a mix of information to consider on what to fund in an Urban Renewal Plan. He looked at the plan from the Downtown perspective and the Riverfront perspective. Here is a place to have some discussion about potential projects in the Downtown Area and the Riverfront Area. He sent out an email which it is not the correct list, but is a standing point to react to. There is a lot of information and a lot of projects listed that will need some additional explanation. There were discussions about what the growth rate would be, which is between 6% and 7%. There was some discussion about 6.5%, which was considered when I was listing possible projects that could be considered, that ended up being at approximately \$65 million dollars, which is not quite halfway between \$53 million and \$71 million.

CDD Rux noted we could start by looking at the Riverfront Area thinking about where infrastructure could potentially leverage new private development for new investment that would create employment opportunities. In the project list we have some projects that are more Community based, the trail systems and the esplanade is another example. CDD Rux asked Chair Bridges and the Committee on how you want to approach this discussion.

Chair Bridges noted on the survey he gave answers for items he firmly thought should be done. His answers were yes if he felt strongly about them and no if he felt strongly about others. The ones he didn't answer he wasn't feeling very strongly about and would easily be swayed by the Committee. Particularly the Riverfront Area, he felt a dilemma because if you're going to develop a sub area then you have to pay for all the utilities, wastewater, stormwater and roads. You have to have

all utilities there to be ready to be developed. He noted we should figure out where it makes the most sense to invest. He noted there is land use criteria about orderly extension of infrastructure. He noted that would be a great idea, and if so where would that start. We have to have the whole package for sub areas and where does it make sense to do that. Where are all of the utilities already existing?

Member Stoller noted it makes since.

Member Olson agreed noting to fully fund the infrastructure development, the City staff can tell us which parts are more crucial or not. She noted yes on the survey for both Riverfront and Downtown Area. If we increase the value of the Downtown buildings, we need to first fix the water and wastewater pipes. There are nice things to do like sidewalks, which has a path for funding already so she didn't prioritize those. She noted infrastructures have to come first or we won't get the development. We might all disagree on the nice to haves, but especially where we can find partners like CPRD, where we can do part and CPRD fund part.

Member Clements noted one of his concerns as an agency that's going to be giving up its revenue, asked are we looking at the incremental situations on the taxing districts in 30 years, which is way too long, and would they dictate the length of time.

CDD Rux explained what is in the feasibility study is a 30 year length program. The response on the incremental is no, as tax revenue comes on it comes into the Urban Renewal District, the taxing districts get their proportional share of the frozen base. Then development happens faster, Urban Renewal Plan can be finished quicker and if development happens slower, then you still end out there at 30 years.

Member Clements noted what's bothering him is the amount in the end. He is concerned as an agency that is giving up tax revenue to go into this. He noted the administration cost at over \$9 million, which is about \$300,000 thousand a year and is wondering what that money is going to be spent on.

CDD Rux responded that goes back to the feasibility study. In the administration cost we ran a couple different scenarios. We looked at what the true cost would be starting in five years. There would be a staff person that would administer the Urban Renewal Program and coordinate with engineering on all the capital improvement projects and private development. Other costs we have are an audit to be done and finance department costs. We ran the number internally, when we were looking at true costs of personnel and different departments providing services it was over \$20 million dollars. He sat down with the City Manager had a conversation about putting the money towards infrastructure projects not as much towards administration. He had conversations with Elaine about what some other jurisdictions had done and we ended up at the \$9 million dollars aspects for the administration cost which is substantially less than the projected actual costs. We had the internal conversation saying that means the general fund is back filling some of the costs in order to do the Urban Renewal Program from general property taxes.

Member Clements asked why the City wouldn't fund it all, the other taxing entities are giving up their money and not getting money out the project.

CDD Rux responded the City is giving up some of its frozen base money in order to support the program so the dollars go to infrastructure improvements.

Chair Bridges asked on the Riverfront Area, if you have infrastructure for sub area one, and all the infrastructure for sub area two, could it be an orderly extension of the Riverfront Area?

CDD Rux responded let's start with the Riverfront because what I heard from your comments is this area has the largest potential for development to occur. In the Riverfront Master Plan in order to achieve the density of development that is identified, we need three transportation routes in and out of the Riverfront Area. We have S Wynooski Street, S River Street and S Blaine Street. S Blaine Street is the extension that goes from E Ninth Street, parallels the railroad tracks and connects with S College Street. If we don't have S Blaine Street, S River Street and S Wynooski Street improvements, the level of development that is anticipated cannot be supported with the Transportation System, it overloads the State Transportation System, which means we're not meeting the level of service thresholds. He noted there are traffic signals located at E Hancock Street/E First Street on S Blaine Street in order to support those traffic volumes which is one critical piece. The Rogers Landing Road extension is a realignment of the existing road, the question is how we fix some of the

geometry to get in and out. S College Street is a sub area access to get into the Riverfront Area that goes from E Ninth Street down to E Fourteenth Street which is a major collector roadway. S Blaine Street is a major collector roadway. S College Street is a minor collector roadway it goes from E Ninth Street to E Fourteenth Street. S River Street is one of the critical transportation corridors to serve the Riverfront which is a major collector roadway that has sewer, water and storm lines associated with it. There is S River Street that goes from the Bypass down to E Fourteenth Street to Rogers Landing Road. That is part of the major collector system to get traffic in and out of the Riverfront Area which is about \$1.27 million and has water and wastewater lines addition to that. We have the NE Wynooski Road improvements from the Bridge over the Bypass to NE Dog Ridge Road. NE Wynooski Road is a major collector roadway and the improvements were estimated a little over \$900 thousand. There are some sidewalk improvement components, E Ninth Street from S Blaine Street to S River Street, E Fourteenth Street from S College to S River Street, and E Eleventh Street from S River Street to NE Wynooski Road. Off the comments maybe some of the sidewalk improvements could be part of the developer contribution towards infrastructure improvements. The E Hancock Street and S Blaine Street traffic signals are over \$900,000 each. There is another sidewalk project about \$55,000 on E Ninth Street between S Blaine Street and E Charles Street which could be a different funding source.

Chair Bridges noted it doesn't seem appropriate to only look at street development and go through all the street segments that could be done. It makes sense that you package together the street, water and sanitary sewer for a block and add all the cost together, because without all those investments being done it doesn't make since to do one of them. Let's take S River Street from E Ninth Street to E Fourteenth Street and prioritize E Ninth Street through E Twelfth Street full infrastructure except for the sidewalks, because the developer can fund that. That way you have three additional blocks of development. You can advance the project in a way it will leverage development and have a chance of getting the project list done quicker than 30 years.

Member Olson asked Chair Bridges to clarify if he is taking about to do or not to do or are you talking about the order in which they are done.

Chair Bridges replied he is talking about both. It makes since we don't talk about an eight block segment of road, but instead we talk about three blocks that have all the infrastructure. What would it cost to get three blocks of everything complete except for sidewalks then the developer would have everything there?

Member Olson noted we can then turn on sections of the Riverfront based on that they have everything needed for development.

Member Stoller noted on his survey he emphasized on the Riverfront Area more and feels there is already a lot of investment from Community Partners for the Downtown Area. The Downtown Area's biggest impact would be the south end of town, 20 years from now he envisioned what Newberg would look like if it was developed. Private partners for example the Mill Site owners could help with the structure to alleviate the financial burden on the City.

Member Findley noted she agrees with Member Stoller, when thinking about the big picture she leans towards looking at the Mill Site as being a bigger bang for our buck in terms of it will draw things into the Community that we don't already have. The Downtown Area may have some cosmetic items, but it doesn't bring the sort of resources that we would anticipate. She agrees with Member Olson and Chair Bridges in that when looking to prioritize projects, it's hard without the whole package deal and wanted to know the costs. She noted seeing what the whole project would look like in smaller chunks so that we could say yes or no to those chunks.

Member Duder noted he missed the previous meeting and is getting some context on how to review the survey by listening to this conversation, which is helping him to give the survey more thorough replies.

Member Morelock noted it is more constructive to think of areas, than the specific project. He understands there's a level of detail where the City staff prioritizes parts that have to go together. He noted he is excited for the trolley between Downtown and Riverfront, there are some opportunities to connect part of Old Downtown Newberg with new areas. He noted the Riverfront Area is an exciting area to consider which will take considerable infrastructure to be able to accomplish. He noted if we're looking to prioritize he would look at areas more than other ones. Wastewater and stormwater is very important to keep things flowing. There's has to be a bit of balance and to keep the most common projects is important. He noted focus on an area and ones that are critical for the general maintenance and operations. He noted the critical part is that we keep the City infrastructure going which is very important.

Member Clements noted how do make this simpler for the members to understand. He noted the objective of Urban Renewal is to bring in industry and provide opportunities. He is hearing it is more maintenance and repair rather than attracting industry.

CDD Rux noted he would capture the summary of areas, the infrastructure to serve these areas and define the areas. Where there are roadways with street improvements, water, wastewater, storm, sidewalks and he will get those costs. Then we can start to look at breaking those down in segments. For example S River Street from E First Street to E Fourteenth Street we can talk internally and figure out if two segments or one segment. Currently we have it broken into two segments but we can look at it differently. We can look at the Mill Site with all of the infrastructure that was identified in the Master Plan, sewer, water, roads, streets, sidewalks and esplanade. We can come up with some cost estimates and a narrative that needs to go along with the next packet so you can understand. For example what a particular project gets you, first we've got to do this to meet a transportation planning rule, or this one we're doing because it's a Willamette River Greenway issue etc.

Chair Bridges noted when you use S River Street as an example he would like to have a kind of qualitative outcome because when he thinks of S River Street he thinks of it as being pretty much developed with housing on both sides through a major component of that area. He wants to know how much developable and open space you get for phase 1. Compared to S College Street which is wide open from E Ninth Street to E Fourteenth Street would be all developable land.

CDD Rux responded S College Street is pretty much developed down to Andrews Street, and there is a new subdivision in once you get to the Stream Corridor, but you get closer to the Bypass then yes, there is open land.

CDD Rux noted he understands and will put together what you're asking for, we will need to cancel our next meeting and give everyone a break between the holidays. We will schedule our next meeting on January 25<sup>th</sup>. He noted he will be scheduling a meeting with Brett Musick and Kaaren Hofmann to repackage all the information and addressing the Riverfront Plan and the Downtown Plan separately.

CDD Rux noted they have already started the process of preparing the legal description for the boundary established through the feasibility phase and will take two to three months to put together, which we will share at a future meeting.

Member Olson asked if there was a way to designate areas to what is optional and what is not, for example in order to get this done we have to do this project first to get the value out of this parcel. She noted what do we really need to do to increase property tax revenue, a lot of us are trying to figure out by going through this and if we knew which ones were optional that would help.

CDD Rux noted something to think about is you need a traffic signal at E Hancock Street / N Blaine Street and E First Street/S Blaine Street. Railroad crossing upgrades are needed. Not much is going to happen with redevelopment of the Riverfront given FRA regulations where you're going to have the crossing arms and safety pieces. He shared we know from the staff level what all those critical items are.

Chair Bridges noted if we think of a 30 year horizon, when you start to think about what you have to do on First Street and Hancock Street, can we also have an asterisk footnote that says, this drops away if it is no longer ODOT's jurisdiction.

CDD Rux responded he has had conversations with ODOT, Hancock Street and 99W will be ODOT for several generations more. The only way they would ever release 99W to the City would be if the Bypass is fully constructed into four lanes, two lanes going each direction and they move the entire freight route system to the Bypass.

Chair Bridges asked if the City actually considered taking jurisdiction of the roads, perhaps people outside the City would be lobbying ODOT for that activity.

CDD Rux noted he doesn't disagree, but doesn't think that's going to happen in his grandkids lifetime, because of the volume of traffic in the regional model that is here, they're not going to give up.

Chair Bridges noted because of the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR), when you exceed a volume over capacity ratio you choose a different City and have a different ratio, our City's critical ratio is .75. City of Tigard's ratio is 1.05 so they

get to do development without any restriction or change, because ODOT set the limit. He noted we can lobby to have ODOT set different limits. We will need to engage in discussions with ODOT. He noted for example ODOT told him he couldn't have a banner that says "Home to George Fox" and asked why. ODOT replied you have to have the City adopt each of the slogans as a City slogan.

CDD Rux noted one of the things that is in the Downtown plan is to get the Downtown Area designated as a Special Transportation Area (STA), which requires Oregon Transportation Commission authorization that will give us the alternative mobility standards above the baseline threshold. Part of the process is we need to have Phase 2 of the Bypass, Hwy 219 to Rex Hill done to make that work. We will be having conversations again with ODOT about an STA in the Downtown Area, but will still need the traffic signals at Hancock and Blaine Street.

Member Olson noted they are there to help with conversations with ODOT.

# **PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

None

# **ITEMS FROM COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

None

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Bridges adjourned meeting at 6:18pm

# APPROVED BY THE AD HOC URBAN RENEWAL CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE this JANUARY 25, 2021

John Bridges, UR CAC Chair

Doug Rux, Recording Secretary



**Community Development Department** 

P.O. Box 970 • 414 E First Street • Newberg, Oregon 97132 503-537-1240 • Fax 503-537-1272 • www.newbergoregon.gov

# MEMORANDUM

TO:	Ad Hoc Urban Renewal Citizens Advisory Committee
FROM:	Doug Rux, Community Development Director
SUBJECT:	January 25, 2021 CAC Meeting
DATE:	January 25, 2021

At the November 23, 2020 Ad Hoc Urban Renewal Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) meeting staff was asked to repackage projects from the potential list projects list in a way that packages together the street, water, wastewater, stormwater, trails, etc. into subareas to better understand possible sequencing of projects and the benefits those projects would have in attracting new development. Attached is a map of the overall boundary of the proposed urban renewal area. Staff has identified has identified Subareas A – H which are shown in the attached graphics within the proposed urban renewal area. Staff also has provided a graphic from the Riverfront Master Plan and Downtown Improvement Plan to assist the Committee members in getting a visual orientation. Also attached is Appendix D – Infrastructure from the Riverfront Master Plan and graphics for stormwater/wastewater/water in the Downtown area to assist you in getting a visual of where infrastructure improvements are anticipated.

Brett Musick, Senior Engineer, has prepared a spreadsheet that details out the infrastructure projects based on the subareas. In Subarea H that covers the downtown area he has additionally included projects in the categories of Signage & Wayfinding, North/South Connections, Downtown Trolley, Parking, Pedestrian Furniture, Building Façade Program, and Second Street Utility Undergrounding.

I would note that questions have been received since our last meeting about items not on this list which include System Development Charge assistance, Building Permit Fee assistance, Land Use Planning Fee assistance, Art Pedestals, and funding assistance for affordable housing. Costing for these items has not occurred.

At our meeting we will continue the discussion on project costs attempting to shorten the project list to align with a selected Growth Rate, Financial Capacity (2020 \$), and Maximum Indebtedness. I have attached the memo from Tiberius Solutions that was shared at the November 9, 2020 meeting as background for the portion of the discussion surrounding the Growth Rate, Financial Capacity (2020 \$), and Maximum Indebtedness.

Attachments: 1. Proposed Urban Renewal Area Map

- 2. Subarea Maps A H
- 3. Riverfront Master Plan Map

- 4. Downtown Improvement Plan Map
- 5. Riverfront Infrastructure
- 6. Maps for Downtown Stormwater/Wastewater/Water
- 7. Projects Costs by Subarea
- 8. Tiberius Solutions Memo November 2, 2020



Coordinate System: NAD 1983 HARN StatePlane Oregon North FIPS 3601 Feet Intl Projection: Lambert Conformal Conic Datum: North American 1983 HARN False Easting: 8,202,099.7375 False Northing: 0.0000 Central Meridian: -120.5000 Standard Parallel 1: 44.3333 Standard Parallel 2: 46.0000 Latitude Of Origin: 43.6667 Units: Foot Document Path: O:\GIS\MapRequest\Doug\Proposed Tax Increment Financing Area.mxd Date Saved: 3/12/2020 2:51:31 PM

Author: Keith McKinnon, GIS Analyst

# **Proposed Tax Increment Financing Area**



**OR-18 Bypass** 

IMPORTANT NOTICE TO ALL USERS:

DISCLAIMER AND LIMITATION OF LIABILITY This information is not guaranteed to be accurate and may contain errors and omissions. The City of Newberg provides NO WARRANTY AS TO THE MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE FOR ANY INFORMATION HEREIN.

This map is created from various data sources and is subject to change without notice. This map is intended for general planning purposes only.

# ATTACHMENT 1





























RIVERFRONT MASTER PLAN <sub>City of Newberg</sub>

# Technical Memorandum 4: Infrastructure Needs

31 of 67



# MEMORANDUM

DATE:	April 12, 2019
TO:	Andrew Parish, AICP Angelo Planning
FROM:	Jane Vail, P.E. Wallis Engineering
RE:	Infrastructure Needs for Newberg Riverfront Master Plan Update Job No. 1441A
EXHIBITS:	Exhibit A – Existing Water System Map Exhibit B – Existing Wastewater System Map Exhibit C – Existing Storm Drainage Map Exhibit D – Recommended Water System Improvements Exhibit E – Wastewater System Sub-Basins Exhibit F – Recommended Wastewater System Improvements

# BACKGROUND

The City of Newberg's Riverfront Master Plan Update has included the creation and evaluation of several land use/transportation alternatives for the Riverfront Area. Through discussion with the project's advisory committees, stakeholders, and property owners in the Riverfront Area, the process has resulted in the selection of a preferred alternative, "Alternative E." This land use/transportation program includes a variety of uses in the study area, including single-family and multi-family residential developments, mixed-use nodes of activity, parks and passive open space, and employment uses.

This memorandum describes the existing utility infrastructure and previously-planned improvements to this infrastructure within the planning area. It also provides recommendations for improvements to the water, wastewater, and stormwater infrastructure as the area develops.

The current planning effort will update the 2002 Newberg Riverfront Master Plan. That previous plan made specific recommendations as to infrastructure improvements based on anticipated phasing and land use.

215 W 4th Street, Suite 200 Vancouver, WA 98660 Office (360) 695-7041 Fax (360) 694-1043 www.walliseng.net

At the time of the 2002 Riverfront Master Plan, the riverfront industrial site (WestRock) was not included in the riverfront planning area, and the Newberg-Dundee Bypass was in the conceptual design phase - and at a different alignment than constructed. In other words, the 2002 Master Plan's recommended street and utility improvements were based on different conditions than the current existing conditions. However, from the perspective of total water demand and wastewater flow, there are few differences between the land uses shown in the 2002 Master Plan and Yamhill County zoning efforts and the preferred land use alternatives identified in the current planning effort. The overall water demand and projected wastewater flow values from past land use planning efforts are reflected in the City's 2017 Water Master Plan and 2018 Wastewater Master Plan. The recommendations made in these two utility master plans are still relevant to the current planning effort.

In the course of preparing this memorandum, the following planning documents were reviewed:

- 2002 Newberg Riverfront Master Plan
- 2002 City of Newberg Water Treatment Facilities Plan
- 2007 City of Newberg Wastewater Treatment Plant Facilities Plan Update
- 2007 City of Newberg Sewerage Master Plan Update
- 2014 City of Newberg Stormwater Master Plan Update
- 2015 Newberg Wastewater I&I Study
- 2016 City of Newberg Comprehensive Plan Text (Ordinance 1967)
- 2017 City of Newberg Water Master Plan
- 2018 City of Newberg Wastewater Master Plan
- 1996 Yamhill County Comprehensive Land Use Plan

# EXISTING AND PLANNED UTILITY INFRASTRUCTURE

Existing utilities within the project area include wastewater, stormwater, potable water, and private utilities (electricity, natural gas, and telecommunications). Much of the project area is relatively underdeveloped, so utilities are limited in extent and size.

# <u>Water System</u>

The existing water system is owned and operated by the City of Newberg. The study area is located within Zone 1, which is served by three reservoirs: the North Valley Reservoir Nos. 1 and 2 located on the north side of the City, and the Corral Creek Reservoir, located east of the City. These reservoirs are fed by transmission mains from the water treatment plant, which is located on the southeast corner of the study area. A well field south of the study area supplies a portion of the City's water, which is conveyed to their water treatment plant. A water transmission main conveys treated drinking water from the treatment plant north through the riverfront industrial site to the rest of the City.

The area north of the Bypass is served by an existing water distribution network, with distribution mains 2 to 8 inches in diameter. Several properties just south of the Bypass, including the riverfront industrial site, are also served by water main extensions from the distribution system north of the Bypass.

Non-potable water system elements were not reviewed as part of this memorandum effort. The City of Newberg has a re-use water system, which is currently confined to the City's Wastewater Treatment Plant. The riverfront industrial site property has water rights to water from the Willamette River, and this privately-owned non-potable water was used in the past for mill operations. Additional details about this non-potable water system were not available.

A map of the existing potable water system within the project limits is included as *Exhibit* A on the following page.

No planned improvements to the water system within the planning area are described in the City's 2017 Water Master Plan. The 2002 Newberg Riverfront Master Plan proposed water distribution mains along the roads proposed and recommended for improvement by that planning effort.

# Wastewater System

Existing wastewater infrastructure within the project limits is largely limited to the area north of the Bypass. The City of Newberg's wastewater treatment plant is located just east of the project study area.

The portion of the study area north of the Bypass is currently served by two lift stations (the Charles Lift Station and the Andrew Lift Station) and a network of gravity sewer mains and trunk lines, which ultimately convey wastewater west to the City's wastewater treatment plant. A small lift station also serves Rogers Landing, conveying wastewater to the gravity sewer system to the north. The riverfront industrial site is served by a single gravity sewer connection at the northwest corner of the site.

A map of the existing wastewater system within the project limits is included as *Exhibit B*.

The City's 2018 Wastewater Master Plan recommends improvements to the existing wastewater system within the planning area. The Wastewater Master Plan proposed abandoning the Charles Lift Station and Andrew Lift Station in the northeast portion of the study area, and replacing them with a single lift station (the Riverfront Lift Station) and a series of gravity mains (projects C4.b and C3.b in the Wastewater Master Plan). The Riverfront Lift Station would also serve a portion of the southeast portion of the study area with several gravity sewer extensions to the south and the east. The Wastewater Master Plan also recommended upsizing several gravity mains within the study area to convey future flows. No wastewater improvements are described for the eastern portion of the study area. The 2002 Riverfront Master Plan proposed some gravity mains along the roads proposed and recommended for improvement by that planning effort.

# Stormwater System

The study area is drained by a system of natural drainages, open channels, and storm drain lines. Currently, the study area drains in three directions: west to Chehalem Creek, south to the Willamette River, and east to Hess Creek.

The southern portion of the site lies within the 100-year flood plain of the Willamette River, and Chehalem Creek.

Underground stormwater lines are few in number, and largely confined to the northern portion of the study area. A stormwater main bisects the study area, conveying stormwater from the drainage lines in the northern portion of the study area south to outfall at the Willamette River. This line was previously the wastewater outfall from the former wastewater treatment plant.

A map of the existing drainage and stormwater system within the project limits is included as *Exhibit C*.







No improvements to the stormwater system within the planning area are currently included in the 2014 City of Newberg Stormwater Master Plan Update. The 2002 Riverfront Master Plan proposed stormwater lines along some of the roads proposed and recommended for improvement by that planning effort. It also proposed disposal of stormwater runoff into to the existing stormwater main outfalling to the Willamette River. The capacity of that existing stormwater main to accept additional flow was not discussed in the 2002 Plan.

# Franchise Utilities

As part of this planning effort, the City of Newberg contacted privately-owned franchise utilities in order to generally ascertain the extent of their facilities within the planning area. These franchise utility companies currently provide electricity, gas, cable, and telephone services to customers within the planning area.

PGE provides electricity to Newberg, and has a substation on the riverfront industrial site. In contacting PGE, they were unaware of any known issues serving the area.

NW Natural provides natural gas within the planning area, though their mapped facilities appear to be largely located north of the Bypass. They do have a 12-inch high pressure gas line serving the riverfront industrial site. This line is also the primary feed for the City of Newberg.

Comcast and Frontier provide cable and telephone services within the planning area. Frontier has very little facilities within the planning area, and no facilities south of the Newberg-Dundee Bypass.

# RECOMMENDED UTILITY INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS

Improvements to the existing water, wastewater, and stormwater infrastructure will be necessary in order to support the preferred land use alternative. Recommended improvements are described in the following paragraphs, organized according to the type of infrastructure. These recommendations are based on the City's standards, the City's GIS system, existing utility infrastructure plans, and engineering judgement. No water or wastewater modeling was completed as part of this planning effort.

It is important to note that recommendations are limited by the general nature of land use planning, and that further utility master planning will be necessary to confirm and elaborate on the recommendations made in this memorandum.

# <u>Water System</u>

The area south of the Newberg-Dundee Bypass and a small area on the west side of the study area just north of the Bypass currently have no water distribution system. As this area develops, it will require an entirely new water distribution network. New water mains should be constructed within the footprint of proposed roadways. To serve new development south of the Bypass, a water distribution main can be extended west from the transmission main near the water treatment plant. This new water distribution main should extend to the western portion of the study area, and should connect to the existing water system to the north where possible to provide a fully looped system. To serve the north side of the Bypass, a water main should also be connected to the water main serving the area south of the Bypass to provide a fully looped system.

The majority of the study area north of the Bypass is currently served by an existing water distribution network. The size of existing distribution mains are relatively small within this area, and will likely not provide sufficient fire flow for future connections as the area south of the Bypass develops. Some improvements will be necessary to the distribution system north of the Bypass in order to make distribution network connections to serve the planning area.

The minimum size of water distribution mains will be 8-inches, per City standards. Final sizing will require a more in depth analysis to ensure that minimum fire flow is maintained throughout the water system in accordance with City standards.

Recommended improvements to the existing potable water system are illustrated in *Exhibit D* on the following page and summarized in **Table 1** below.

Table 1 – Recommended Water Infrastructure Improvements

Description	Sub-basin	Minimum Size	Length
Water Main	В	8-Inch	8,200 ft

It should be noted that the developer of the riverfront industrial site has the capability of using the existing non-potable water system infrastructure, and water rights.

# Wastewater System

The planning area currently lacks a complete wastewater system, and will require extensive sewer infrastructure improvements to serve new development. In order to determine these system improvements, the study area was broken into six sub-basins according to the existing collection system and topography. These sub-basins are shown in *Exhibit E*. The wastewater infrastructure necessary to serve these sub-basins is illustrated on *Exhibit F* and summarized in **Table 2** below.

Description	Sub-basin Served	Size/Capacity
Riverfront Lift Station	В	950 gpm <sup>1</sup>
Force Main B1	В	8-in <sup>1</sup> , 1000 ft
Gravity Main B1	В	8-in, 2600 ft
Gravity Main B2	В	8-in, 1600 ft
Gravity Main B3	В	8-in, 3400 ft
Gravity Main B4	A, B, C, D	18-in <sup>1</sup> , 1300 ft
Gravity Main C1	С	8-in, 500 ft
Gravity Main D1	D	10-in, 2400 ft

Table 2 – Recommended Wastewater Infrastructure Improvements

1. Capacity and size are from the City's 2018 Wastewater Master Plan







A detailed description of each sub-basin and the recommended improvement is described below.

**Sub-Basin A**. This sub-basin consists of the northern portion of the study area that is served by an existing network of gravity wastewater lines. Because this area is highly developed, and the proposed master plan does not significantly change land use, no new wastewater infrastructure is required beyond that recommended by the 2018 Wastewater Master Plan.

**Sub-Basin B**. This sub-basin consists of the western portion of the study area – currently served by the Charles Lift Station and Andrew Lift Station – and the additional area to be served by the proposed Riverfront Lift Station and associated collection system described in the Wastewater Master Plan. As discussed above, the Wastewater Master Plan recommended abandoning the Charles Lift Station and Andrew Lift Station. This will require upgrading the Riverfront Lift Station and force main, constructing several new gravity sewers, and upsizing one existing gravity sewer. No major changes are recommended to this proposed infrastructure, although minor adjustments to sewer alignments will be necessary to match proposed roads. This infrastructure is labeled as Gravity Main B1, B2, B3, and B4, and Force Main B1 on *Exhibit E*.

**Sub-Basin C**. This sub-basin consists of a mostly undeveloped land and a small portion of the riverfront industrial site in the vicinity of S River Street. Based upon the depth of the existing sewer in S. River Street (per City GIS), this area can be served by a gravity sewer extension, shown as Gravity Main C1 on *Exhibit E*.

**Sub-Basin D**. This area consists of the eastern portion of the riverfront industrial site. This sub-basin can be served by gravity lines flowing east into the existing trunk line on NE Wynooski Road, which currently conveys wastewater to the wastewater treatment plant. This line is labeled as Gravity Main D1 on *Exhibit E*.

**Sub-Basin E**. This sub-basin consists of the parks and open space within the study area, largely located within the flood plain and stream corridors. Rogers Landing is currently the only portion of this sub-basin with sewer service. Rogers Landing is served by a lift station, pumping wastewater to the collection system north of the Newberg-Dundee Bypass. Because most of this sub-basin lies within the flood plain, it is unlikely to see significant development. It has been suggested that the Rogers Landing area could be the future site of an amphitheater, as well as potential additional park improvements. Depending on the projected wastewater flows and the capacity of the existing lift station, improvements may be necessary to the lift station and potentially the force main. If new facilities are constructed outside of the Rogers Landing area, they will require new lift stations to convey flow to the collection system, because this sub-basin lies at a lower elevation than the rest of the City.

Final alignment and sizing of new sewer system infrastructure will be determined during final design of street infrastructure and development. Alignment and sizing will depend on the specific developments that are constructed, locations of roads, and exact depths of existing gravity lines.

# Stormwater System

The existing stormwater system within the planning area consists of stormwater drainage collection and conveyance facilities north of the Bypass. All development will need to comply with the City's stormwater management requirements, as articulated in their Design Standards.

In accordance with these requirements, any development within the planning area will need to collect, treat, detain, convey, and dispose of the stormwater runoff generated by the development. This applies to public improvements that generate impervious surfaces – such as streets, sidewalks, and paths. It also applies to private developments, which construct roofs, streets, sidewalks, and parking lots.

Collection and conveyance of stormwater runoff will likely consist of a combination of underground structure and pipes, and low-impact development conveyance improvements, such as swales and flow-through planters. Treatment of stormwater runoff will likely consist of either mechanical or low-impact development treatment facilities. Detention of stormwater can take place using underground storage, ponds, and other methods. There is considerable flexibility as to the specific design of stormwater collection, conveyance, treatment, and detention facilities. A variety of factors will influence specific design solutions, such as site geography, available land surface, soil conditions, City preference, developer preference, construction cost, long-term maintenance costs, and aesthetics.

There may be some conveyance within the study area through underground stormwater pipes, which are often constructed within publicly-owned streets. Assuming the proposed and existing streets shown on the preferred alternative, we estimate a total of at least 12,000 linear feet of stormwater mains. This number does not account for the variation of street alignments that may occur as the City moves forward with planning and design, and does not include the construction of additional streets and associated storm conveyance.

Treated stormwater runoff is typically disposed of using infiltration into native soils or by conveyance into an adjacent stormwater facility or natural body of water. All methods of disposal have specific requirements and limitations. Disposal of stormwater runoff will depend on site-specific soil characteristics, the location of the site with respect to adjacent stormwater infrastructure, and the capacity of adjacent infrastructure.

Infiltration of treated stormwater runoff is often preferred over other methods because of its simplicity and relatively lower cost. However, native soils must be capable of infiltrating stormwater at or above a minimum rate for infiltration of runoff to be a viable disposal method. That capability can only be determined by onsite tests, and native soils can vary greatly in characteristics throughout an area.

According to the soils map included in the City's 2014 Stormwater Master Plan Update, native soils within the planning area are generally classified as having lower infiltration capability. This map is based on general information; the actual infiltration rates at specific locations within the planning area will vary. As each property develops, the developer will determine soil conditions and the viability of infiltration as a method of stormwater disposal. It should be noted that the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality requires registration of underground infiltration facilities such as drywells per their Underground Injection Control Program. It should also be noted that infiltration of the environmental sensitivity of an area; infiltration of stormwater runoff into a floodplain or wetland is not typically acceptable.

If stormwater runoff cannot be disposed of by infiltration, it will need to be conveyed to another location, such as an adjacent stormwater pipe, pond, or infiltration facility. If an adjacent stormwater facility is available, the developer will need to demonstrate that it has capacity for disposing stormwater from the proposed development. If this adjacent stormwater facility is owned by other individuals or entities, rights to access, use, and maintenance will need to be negotiated between all parties. Treated stormwater runoff can also be disposed of in an adjacent body of water. There are multiple stream corridors within the study area, including the Willamette River. It is important to note that disposal of stormwater runoff to these corridors may trigger additional permitting and engineering requirements according to the governing regulatory authorities. Disposal of stormwater runoff in these bodies of water should consider the hydraulic and erosion control implications of additional runoff, with the goal of protecting these existing stream corridors. They should also consider the characteristics of the treated runoff. The City's TDML Implementation Plan is the primary regulatory driver for stormwater runoff, including bacteria, mercury, and water temperature. However, other regulatory authorities will have jurisdiction for disposal of treated stormwater runoff within stream corridors in the planning area. The developer will likely need to consult with an environmental permitting specialist in order to determine the specific regulatory requirements for their stormwater management improvements.

The construction of a regional stormwater facility for treatment, detention, and/or disposal may address many of the difficulties individual developers face with stormwater management. There are, however, very limited options for locating such a facility. Public ownership of land is limited within the project area to landfill property owned by Yamhill County to areas within the floodplain (such as Rogers Landing, leased by Yamhill County from the City and two private owners).

One area that might be considered for possible use as a regional stormwater facility are the existing lagoons at the southeast corner of the planning area, within the riverfront industrial site property. It could be feasible to repurpose these existing lagoons as stormwater detention ponds for treated stormwater runoff from the surrounding areas, with modifications to the existing outfall to allow controlled disposal of runoff to the Willamette River. These two lagoons currently hold water, and outfall to the Willamette River. In the past, the lagoons were used for disposal of paper mill process water; the degree of biological and/or chemical contamination, the dimensions, and the condition of the lagoons are relatively unknown.

Any use of these ponds for stormwater management will likely necessitate investigation of the condition of the lagoon basin floor for contaminants which might adversely affect the Willamette River. Depending on the degree of contamination and the requirements of regulatory authorities, cleanup might also be required. In addition, some agreement would need to be made for stormwater conveyance to the pond, pond use, access, and maintenance between the property owner, the City, and properties contributing stormwater.

Please note that we cannot recommend specific details as to proposed stormwater improvements. The sizing of stormwater facilities will depend entirely on development of each site, and how much onsite detention and/or infiltration is built.

# Franchise Utilities

As part of this master planning effort, City staff spoke directly with franchise utilities within the planning area to elicit comments and concerns regarding the proposed plan.

When contacted for feedback, PGE noted that some industrial and commercial uses may have larger loads and require upgrades to their facilities. The extent of this work would be determined at the development phase. PGE was concerned that improvements protect their existing facilities in the area – particularly the substation on the riverfront industrial site. In conversations with the City, NW Natural expressed concerns that their existing infrastructure is protected throughout future development, particularly the high pressure line serving Newberg (located on the riverfront industrial site).

Comcast had no concerns of note.

Frontier noted that they have minimal facilities within the planning area, and noted that with their current facilities they could serve around 200 new customers. Their facilities appear to be largely located north of the Bypass, so serving new customers south of the Bypass would require construction of new facilities – another 100 customers could be served with this work. Increasing service beyond that point would require more new facility construction and considerable expense on Frontier's part.





# STORMWATER MASTER PLAN UPDATE

FIGURE 6-1. CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS

NEWBERG60REGON

# ATTACHMENT 6 Storm





#### **ATTACHMENT 6**



Sub Area						
A						
	Public Transportation, Water, Wastewater and Storm Infrastructure				18	3,084,05
	Riverfront Trails					626,20
		τοται			10	710 25
В		TUTAL			0 10	5,710,25
5	Public Transportation, Water, Wastewater and Storm Infrastructure				10	).182.214
	Riverfront Trails					369,86
		TOTAL			5 10	,552,07
C						
	Public Transportation, Water, Wastewater and Storm Infrastructure			:	2	2,820,93
	Riverfront Trails			:		828,00
					_	
		TOTAL			3	648,93
U	Public Transportation, Water, Waterwater and Sterm Infractructure					. 022 12
	Public transportation, water, wastewater and storm innastructure					),95Z,1Z
		τοται			. 6	.932.12
E						,,
	Public Transportation, Water, Wastewater and Storm Infrastructure			:	4	1,507,17
		TOTAL		:	4	,507,178
F						
	Public Transportation, Water, Wastewater and Storm Infrastructure			:	5	5,035,94
		TOTAL		:	5	<b>,035,9</b> 4
G						
	Public Transportation, Water, Wastewater and Storm Infrastructure			:	4	1,535,82
		τοται				1 525 82
н		TOTAL				,555,62
	Public Transportation. Water. Wastewater and Storm Infrastructure				41	L.436.90
	SIGNAGE & WAYFINDING, NORTH/SOUTH CONNECTIONS, DOWNTOWN TROLLEY, PARKING*		\$	6,677,481 to 5	8	3,437,40
	* Includes cost estimate range for the Second Street Parking Garage alternatives.					
	PEDESTRIAN FURNITURE, TRASH CANS, ETC.			:		175,600
	BUILDING FACADE PROGRAM			:		500,00
	SECOND STREET UTILITY UNDERGROUNDING			4	1	L,833,200
		TOTAL	\$	50,623,187 to 3	52	2,383,11
	TOTAL of SU	B AREAS	\$	104,545,519	106	5,305,444
*Assumes 6% growt	h rate with Maximum Indebtedness of \$99,300,000 and 10% Administration charge.					
	······································					
GRAND TOTAL	- URBAN RENEWAL PROJECT COST ESTIMATES - 2020*		\$	114,475,519	116	6,235,444
Includes cost estimation	ate range for the Second Street Parking Garage alternatives.					
dditional Referen	ce Information					
eneralized Allocatio	ons for Water and Storm Projects By Sub Areas					
owntown waterline	replacements - Amount allocated in the 5/7/2020 Orban Renewal Potential Project Cost Estimate Sub Area H	25:	Ś	3.450.140	. 3	5,535,14
	Sub Area G		;	85,000		
		Total	\$	3,535,140		
iverfront waterline r	projects - Amount allocated in the 5/7/2020 Linhan Renewal Potential Project Cost Estimates:					8 749 12
	Sub Area E		\$	292,900		,,.2
	Sub Area B		\$	1,200,890		
	Sub Area A	T-1-1	\$ ¢	2,255,330		
		iotal	Ş	3,749,120		
verfront stormwate	r projects - Amount allocated in the 5/7/2020 Urban Renewal Potential Project Cost Estimates:			:	5	5,090,40
	Sub Area D		\$ ¢	551,460		
	Sub Area A		ډ \$	2,799,720		
				, , =-		

URBAN RENEWAL UPDATED P	ROJECT CO May 7	<b>ST ESTIM</b> 7, 2020	ATES - Updated	to 2020 Dollars				
Revised for Project Costs per Ul	Revised for Project Costs per UR Sub Areas - Combined Transportation, Wastewater, Water and Stormwater January 18, 2021							
Riverfront Mast	er Plan Pla: Sub A	nning Lev	el Cost Estimate	25				
	5457							
Public Transportation	, Wastewate	r, Water an	d Storm Infrastruc	ture				
				Estimated Project Cost	Other Po	tential Funding	Sources	
		UR Sub Area		Combined Transportation, WW, WW & SD	City System Development Charges	Grants	Other	
Description					% Eligible	Source		
E Fourtenth Street Extension - S River St to NE Dog Ridge Rd		A	\$3,090,600	\$5,385,320	Note 1		Developer, ODOT Immediate Opportunity Fund	
Wastewater Project	n/a		¢027.200		Nata 1		Developer	
water Project Stormwater Project			\$937,280 \$1.357.440		Note 1 Note 1		Developer	
			+_,,					
E <i>Industrial St (1)</i> - E Fourtenth St Ext to Wynooski St		A	\$2,897,438	\$4,624,538	Note 1		Developer, ODOT Immediate Opportunity	
Wastewater Project	GM D1		\$848 400		Note 1		Fund	
Water Project	GIVIDI		\$878,700		Note 1		Developer	
Stormwater Project	n/a							
S Industrial St (2) - Bypass to E Fourtenth St			\$1,352,138	\$1 352 138			Developer.	
Ext		Α		<i>Ţ</i> <u></u> ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	Note 1		ODOT Immediate Opportunity Fund	
Wastewater Project	n/a							
Stormwater Project	n/a							
S <i>Industrial St (3)</i> - E Industrial St (1) to E Fourtenth St Ext		A	\$1,448,719	\$1,888,069	Note 1		Developer, ODOT Immediate Opportunity Fund	
WW Project	n/a		<b>4</b> · ·		N			
w SW	n/a		\$439,350		Note 1		Developer	
Wynooski Street - Bypass to NE Dog Ridge Road		A	\$1,942,988	\$2,748,968	Note 1		Developer, ODOT Immediate Opportunity Fund	
Wastewater Project	n/a							
Water Project Stormwater Project	n/a		\$805,980		Note 1		Developer	

NE Dog Ridge Road			\$1.448.719	\$2 085 019			Developer.
-E Fourtenth Street Extension to Wynooski		А	+ -, · · · ·, ·	\$2,085,015	Note 1		Yamhill
Street							County
Wastewater Project	n/a						
Water Project	n/a						
Stormwater Project			\$636,300		Note 1		Developer
			\$18,084,052	\$18,084,052			
Riverfront Trails	- 1						
Description					Other Po	tential Funding	Sources
		-			City System		5001005
					Development	Grants	Other
					Charges		
					% Eligible	Source	
Hess Creek Nature Trail		Α	\$228,260	\$228,260	Note 1	State Parks	CPRD SDC
Esplanade South of Mill Urban Multi-Use			\$397,940	\$397,940		State Parks,	
Trail		•		. ,	Note 1	ODOT	
					Note 1	Connect	CIND SDC
						Oregon	
			Ş626,20 <b>0</b>	\$626,200			
					Note 1:	Project not in	a current City
						of Newberg I	nfrastructure
						Maste	r Plan
Public Transportation, Water, Wastewa	ater and Stor	m Infrastructu	ure	\$18,084,052			
Riverfront Trails				\$626,200			
Sub Area A							
Riverfront Master Plan Area Project Costs				\$18,710,252			

URBAN RENEWAL UPDA	TED PROJEC	<b>T COST E</b> May 7, 202	STIMATES - 0	Updated to 2	020 Dollars			
Revised for Project Costs per UF	R Sub Areas S Jai	- Combin tormwate nuary 18, 20	ed Transpor er <sup>D21</sup>	tation, Waste	water, Water and			
Riverfront	Master Pla	n Plannin Sub Area	ng Level Cost B	Estimates				
Public Transportation, Wastewater, Wa	ater and Storr	n Infrastru	cture					
					Estimated Project Cost	Other Po	tential Funding	z Sources
-		UR Sub Area			Combined Transportation, WW, WW & SD	City System Development Charges	Grants	Other
Description			TSP Project			% Eligible	Source	
Rogers Landing Rd Extension - Willamette River to UGB Wastewater Project Water Project Stormwater Project	n/a n/a n/a	В	E06	\$1,423,494	\$1,423,494	100%		Yamhill County
	ii yu							+
S River Street Improvements - Bypass to Rogers Landing Rd		В	-	\$1,227,150	\$2,034,140	Note 1		Developer
Wastewater Project	GMC1			\$161,600				-
Water Project				\$263,610		Note 1		Developer
Stormwater Project				\$381,780		Note 1		Developer
E Fourtenth St Sidewalks - S College St to S River St		В	P09	\$83,830	\$83,830	34%		Developer
Rail Crossing Improvements Crossing No. 40A-000.40 (River Street)		В	-	\$419,150	\$419,150	Note 1		Developer, LID, Cost Recovery Agreement
E Fourtenth Street S College St to S River St (Sidewalks in TSP Project P09)	-	В	-	\$646,400	\$1,220,080	Note 1		Developer
Wastewater Project	n/a			****				
stormwater Project				\$234,320 \$339 360		Note 1 Note 1		Developer
				<i>,555,500</i>				Developer
Waterfront Street - S College St to UGB		В	-	\$2,181,600	\$5,001,520	Note 1		Developer, Yamhill County
Wastewater Project	GM B3			\$1,098,880				
Water Project Stormwater Project				\$702,960 \$1,018,080		Note 1 Note 1		Developer Developer
				\$10,182,214	\$10,182,214			

Riverfront Trails						
Description				Other Po	itential Funding	Sources
				City System Development Charges	Grants	Other
				% Eligible	Source	
S River Street to S College Street Urban Multi- Use Trail	В	\$98,172	\$98,172	Note 1	State Parks, ODOT Connect Oregon	CPRD SDC
Esplanade West of S River Street Urban Multi-Use Trail	В	\$153,520	\$153,520	Note 1	State Parks, ODOT Connect Oregon	CPRD SDC
Roger Landing Road Urban Multi-Use Trail	В	\$118,170	\$118,170	Note 1	State Parks	CPRD SDC
		\$369,862	\$369,862			
				Note 1:	Project not in a Newberg Inj Maste	current City of frastructure r Plan
Public Transportation, Water, Wastewater and	Storm Infrastructure		\$10,182,214			
Riverfront Trails		\$369,862				
Sub Area B						
Riverfront Master Plan Area Project Cost	S		\$10,552,076			

URBAN RENEWAL UPDATED P						
Revised for Project Costs per UF V						
Riverfront Mast	er Plan Planning Lev Sub Area C	el Cost Estimate	S			
Public Transportation, Wastewater, Wat	er and Storm Infrastruct	ture				
			Estimated Project Cost	Other Po	tential Funding	Sources
	UR Sub Area		Combined Transportation, WW, WW & SD	City System Development Charges	Grants	Other
Description				% Eligible	Source	
E Ninth St Sidewalks - S Blaine St to Charles St	с	\$55,550	\$55,550	Note 1	ODOT Safe Routes to School	Developer
			\$55,550			ł
Riverfront Trails	ΓΓ					
Description				Other Potential Funding Sources		
				City System Development Charges	Grants	Other
				% Eligible	Source	
Ewing Young Park Nature Trail	с	\$342,390	\$342,390	Note 1	State Parks	CPRD SDC
Chehalem Creek Urban Multi-Use Trail	С	\$485,618	\$485,618	Note 1	State Parks	CPRD SDC
			\$828,008			
WASTEWATER						
Description						
				Othor Do	tontial Euroding	Sourcos
				% Eligible	Source	Sources
Riverfront Lift Station*	С	\$777,700	\$777,700	91%		Developer
Force Main B1*	С	\$120,190	\$120,190	91%		Developer
Gravity Main B1	С	\$840,320	\$840,320	Note 1		Developer
Gravity Main B2	С	\$517,120	\$517,120	Note 1		Developer
Gravity Main B4*	С	\$510,050	\$510,050	91%		Developer
*Projects in the City's 2018 Wastewater Master Plan			\$2,765,380			
Note: Gravity Main B4 and portion of Gravity Main B1 located in Area D are anticipated to be designed and constructed in coordination with the Riverfront Lift Station and Force Main B1 located in Area C.					Project not in of Newberg I Maste	a current City nfrastructure er Plan
Public Transportation, Water, Wastewat	er and Storm Infrastruct	ture	\$2,820,930			
Riverfront Trails			\$828,008			
Sub Area C Riverfront Master Plan Area Projec	ct Costs		\$3,648,938			

URBAN RENEWAL UPDATED	PROJECT ( Ma'	C <b>OST ESTIMA</b> y 7, 2020	TES - Updated	to 2020 Dollars			
Revised for Project Costs per L	JR Sub Are Water an <sub>Janua</sub>	eas - Combine d Stormwate Iry 18, 2021	ed Transportati er	on, Wastewater,			
Riverfront Ma	ster Plan P	lanning Leve	el Cost Estimate	s			
	Sub	) Area D					
Public Transportation Wastewater W	ator and Str	orm Infrastruct					
rubic mansportation, wastewater, w		<u>minimastract</u>		Estimated Project Cost	Other Po	tential Funding	Sources
		UR Sub		Combined	City System	Currente	Other
		Area		WW & SD	Charges	Grants	Other
Description					% Eligible	Source	
S Blaine Street Extension - E Ninth St to S College St		D	\$1,970,914	\$1,970,914	100%		
Wastewater Project	n/a						
Water Project	n/a						
Stormwater Project	n/a						
S College Street Improvements			\$2.954.250	\$3 505 710			
- S Ninth St to E Fourtenth St		D	+_,	\$3,303,710	Note 1	Routes to School	Developer
Wastewater Project	n/a						
Water Project	n/a						
Stormwater Project			\$551,460		Note 1		Developer
E Ninth St Sidowalks		<u> </u>	696 960	60C 0C0			
- S Blaine St to S River St		D	300,000	\$86,860	57%		Developer
E Ninth St Bike Boulevard			\$120.190	\$120,100			
-S Blaine St to S River Street		D	+	\$120,190	57%		
Rail Crossing Improvements Crossing No.			\$454,500	\$454,500			Developer,
40A-000.60 (College Street)		D		. ,	Nota 1		LID, Cost
		D			Note 1		Recovery
							Agreement
ADA Curb Ramps - E Ninth Street, S Blaine Street to S River Street (DKS)			\$793,950	\$793,950		ODOT Safe	
		D			Note 1	Routes to School	Developer
			\$6,932,124	\$6,932,124			
					Note 1:	Project not in of Newberg I Maste	a current City nfrastructure er Plan
Public Transportation, Water, Wastew	ater and Sto	orm Infrastructi	ure	\$6,932,124			
Sub Area D							
Riverfront Master Plan Area Proj	ect Costs			\$6,932 124			

URBAN RENEWAL UPDATED P	ROJECT COS May 7,	<b>ST ESTIMA</b> , 2020	TES - Updated	l to 2020 Dollars			
Revised for Project Costs per UF V	R Sub Areas Vater and S January 1	<b>- Combine</b> Stormwate	ed Transportat r	ion, Wastewater,			
Riverfront Mast	er Plan Plan	nning Leve	l Cost Estimate	es			
	SUD A	rea E					
Public Transportation Wastewater Wa	ter and Stor	m Infrastru					
				Estimated Project Cost	Other Po	tential Funding	Sources
		UR Sub Area		Combined Transportation, WW, WW & SD	City System Development Charges	Grants	Other
Description			4057.004		% Eligible	Source	
S River Street Improvements -E Ninth to Bypass, +/-1000 LF		E	\$957,321	\$1,250,221	35%	ODOT Safe Routes to School	Developer
Wastewater Project	n/a						
Water Project Stormwater Project	n/a		\$292,900		Note 1		Developer
Wynooski St Improvements S River St to Bypass (*reduced to Ninth to Eleventh: +/-650 ft.)	-	E	\$918,292	\$918,292	61%		Developer, Yamhill County
Wastewater Project Water Project Stormwater Project	n/a n/a n/a						
E Eleverath Ct Cidewaller		1	ć70 700	4			
E Eleventh St Sidewalks S River St to Wynooski		E	\$78,780	Ş78,780	34%		Developer
E Eleventh St Bike Boulevard - East of S River Street		E	\$122,210	\$122,210	34%		Developer
E Ninth Street Connection S Pacific Street to Wynooski St	-	E	\$568,125	\$568,125	Note 1		Developer
Wastewater Project	n/a						
Stormwater Project	n/a n/a						
Mill Place Extension - E Ninth Street			\$181,800	\$181.800	Nata 1		Developer
(Connection) to South Terminus Wastewater Project	n/a	E			Note 1		Developei
Water Project	n/a						
Stormwater Project	n/a						
ADA Curb Ramps - E Ninth Street, S River Street to S Pacific Street ( <i>DKS</i> )		E	\$793,950	\$793,950	Note 1	ODOT Safe Routes to School	Developer
ADA Curb Ramps - Intersections Around Scott Leavitt Park, E Eleventh Street, S Willamette Street, S Columbia Street, E Tenth Street ( <i>DKS</i> )		E	\$593,800	\$593 <i>,</i> 800	Note 1		Developer
			\$4,507,178	\$4,507,178			
					Note 1:	Project not in of Newberg I Maste	a current City nfrastructure r Plan
Public Transportation, Water, Wastewa	ter and Storr	m Infrastruc	ture	\$4,507,178			
Sub Area E							
Riverfront Master Plan Area Proje	ct Costs			\$4,507,178			

URBAN RENEWAL UPDATED P							
Revised for Project Costs per UF V							
Riverfront Mast	er Plan Plaı Sub A	nning Lev rea F	el Cost Estimate	S			
	••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••		•				
Public Transportation, wastewater, wa	ter and Storn	n infrastruc	cture	Estimated Project Cost	Other Po	tential Funding	Sources
		UR Sub Area		Combined Transportation, WW, WW & SD	City System Development Charges	Grants	Other
Description					% Eligible	Source	
S River Street Improvements - E Third to E Ninth, +/-2200 LF		F	\$2,106,103	\$5,035,943	35%	ODOT Safe Routes to School	Developer
Wastewater Project	WWMP C2.b		\$2,929,840		12%		
Water Project	n/a						
Stormwater Project	n/a						
Public Transportation, Water, Wastewa Sub Area F	ter and Storn	n Infrastruo	ture	\$5,035,943			1
Riverfront Master Plan Area Proje	ct Costs			\$5,035,943			

	URBAN RENEWAL UPDATED PROJECT COST ESTIMATES - Updated to 2020 Dollars May 7, 2020									
Revi	sed for Project Costs per UR Sub Areas -	Combined January	I Transportation, Waste	water, Wat	er and Storm	water				
	Downtown Improve	ment Plan	Planning Level Cost Esti	mates						
		Sub A	rea G							
Public Transportation	n Infrastructure									
					Estimate	d Project Cost	Other Pot	ential Funding	Sources	
		UR Sub Area			Tr	Combined ansportation, WW, WW & SD	City System Development Charges	Grants	Other	
Description							% Eligible	Source		
Howard Street (Third to	o Fifth) Cost per Block (2016 dollars shown) Number blocks Total Cost (2016 dollars shown)	G	¢	227,541 2	\$532,446	\$856,370	Note 1		Developer	
Wastewater Project		6	ç S Howard, E Sixth to E Third	455,062	\$738 974		50%			
Water Project	WI Replacement	G	S Howard, E Sixti to E Hilla		\$85,000		0%			
Stormwater Project	n/a	•			<i>\$65,666</i>		0,0			
,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,								1	1	
Blaine (Third to Ninth)	Cost per Block (2016 dollars shown) Number blocks Total Cost (2016 dollars shown)	G	TSP Project #S10	225,000 6 \$1,350,000	\$1,579,500	\$2,889,951	15%		Developer	
Wastewater Project	n/a									
Water Project	- E Third to E Ninth	G			\$600,495		Note 1			
Stormwater Project	C-1.C	G			\$442,377		5%			
Stormwater Project	C-1.D	G			\$267,579		5%			
ADA Curb Ramps (DKS	) - S Blaine Street, - E Third Street to E Ninth Street (6 blocks)	G			\$789,500	\$789,500				

Public Infrastructure (Transportation,Water, Wastewater and Storm)

\$4,535,821

1

	URBAN RENEWAL U	PDATED PI	ROJECT COST ESTIMATES - Updated to May 7, 2020	2020 Dollars				
	Revised for Project Costs per UR S	ub Areas -	Combined Transportation, Wastewat	er, Water and Stormwater				
Downtown			Cub Arre II					
Public Transportatio	on Infrastructure							
				Estimated Project Cost		Other Pote	ential Funding	Sources
		UR Sub Area			Combined Transportation, WW, WW & SD	City System Development Charges	Grants	Other
Description		7400			111 0 35	% Eligible	Source	
Hancock Street Road D	Diet (College to Garfield)	н	TSP Project #S07, ODOT Lead	\$1,260,780	\$1,890,060	Note 2		LID
	Cost per Block (2016 dollars shown) Number blocks		215,518					
	Total Cost (2016 dollars shown)		\$ 1,077,590					
Wastewater Project Water Project	n/a M-1 Downtown	н	Hancock, N Grant to N Edwards	\$629,280		34%		
Stormwater Project	n/a			<i>\$025,200</i>		5		
			TSP Project #S07, ODOT Lead		\$13.039.104			LID
First Street Road Diet	(Harrison to River)	п	702 025	\$11,599,678		Note 2		10
	Number blocks		/62,635 13					
	Total Cost (2016 dollars shown)		\$ 9,914,255					
Wastewater Project Water Project	I&I # 23 Waterline Benlacement	н	E First, S College to S Edwards	\$149,884 \$1.089.940		50%		
Stormwater Project	n/a C-1.A	н		\$199,602		5%		
Second Street (Harriso	on to River)	н	70 202	\$192,251	\$192,251	Note 1		Developer
	Number blocks		13					
	Total Cost (2016 dollars shown)		\$ 1,019,018					
Wastewater Project Water Project	n/a n/a							
Stormwater Project	n/a							
River Street (First to St	heridan)				\$200.224			Doveloper
	Cost per Block (2016 dollars shown)		227,541	\$399,334	Ş333,334	Note 1		Developer
	Number blocks		1.5					
Wastewater Project	Total Cost (2016 dollars shown) n/a		\$ 341,312					
Water Project	n/a							
Stormwater Project	n/a							
Center Street (Third to	Sheridan)	н	227 544	\$1,064,892	\$1,399,892	Note 1		Developer
	Number blocks		227,541					
	Total Cost (2016 dollars shown)		\$ 910,164					
Wastewater Project Water Project	n/a WI Replacement			\$335.000		0%		
Stormwater Project	n/a			\$555,000		0,0		
Meridian Street (Third	to Sheridan)	н		\$1,064,892	\$1,316,892	Note 1		Developer
	Cost per Block (2016 dollars shown)		227,541		+_//			
	Number blocks		4 \$ 910.164					
Wastewater Project	n/a		5 510,104					
Water Project	WL Replacement			\$252,000		0%		
Stormwater Project	nya							
Edwards Street (Third	to Sheridan)	н		\$1,064,892	\$1,233,892	Note 1		Developer
	Cost per Block (2016 dollars shown)		227,541					
	Number blocks		4 \$ 910.164					
Wastewater Project	n/a		5 510,104					
Water Project	WL Replacement			\$169,000		0%		
Stormwater Project	n/a							
College Street (Third to	0	н		\$1.064.892	\$1,399,676	Note 1		Developer
	Cost per Block (2016 dollars shown)		227,541		+_,,			
	Number blocks		4 \$ 910.164					
Wastewater Project	1&I # 22	н	S College, E Second to E Fourth	\$165,784		50%		
Water Project Stormwater Project	WL Replacement			\$169,000		0%		
stormwater Frujett							ı	I
School Street (First Str	eet to Sherman)	н		\$532,446	\$532,446	Note 1		Developer
	Cost per Block (2016 dollars shown)		227,541					
	Number blocks Total Cost (2016 dollars shown)		\$ 455.082					
Wastewater Project	n/a		,					
Water Project	n/a							
stormwater Project	n/a						1	1

Howard Street (Third t	:o First)	н		\$266,223	\$351.223	Note 1		Developer
	Cost per Block (2016 dollars shown)		227,541					
	Total Cost (2016 dollars shown)		\$ 227,541					
Wastewater Project	n/a		÷,•					
Water Project	WL Replacement			\$85,000		0%		
Stormwater Project	n/a							
								1
Howard Street (First to	o Sheridan)	н		\$2,317,035	\$2,934,481	Note 1		Developer
	Cost for 2 Blocks (2016 dollars shown)		1,980,372					
Wastewater Project	n/a			¢85.000		0%		
Stormwater Project	n/a			\$85,000		0%		
Stornwater rioject	176							
					6702.010			Developer
Blaine Street (Hancock	c to Sherman)		227 541	\$532,446	\$702,819	Note 1		Developer
	Number blocks		227,341					
	Total Cost (2016 dollars shown)		\$ 455,082					
Wastewater Project	n/a							
Water Project	- E Sheridan to E First	н		\$170,373		0%		
Stormwater Project	n/a							
							1	
Washington Street (Th	ird to Sheridan)	н		\$1,064,892	\$1,346,199	Note 1		Developer
	Cost per Block (2016 dollars shown)		227,541					
	Number blocks		4 010.154					
Wastewater Project	181 # 24b	н	Washington, F First to F Sheridan	\$112.307		50%		
Water Project	WL Replacement			\$169,000		0%		
Stormwater Project	n/a							
							1	l.
Garfield Street (First to	Sheridan)	н		\$532,446	\$729,753	Note 1		Developer
	Cost per Block (2016 dollars shown)		227,541					
	Number blocks		2					
	Total Cost (2016 dollars shown)		\$ 455,082					
Wastewater Project	I&I # 24a	н	Garfield, E First to E Sheridan	\$112,307		50%		
Stormwater Project	wL Replacement			\$85,000		0%		
					·		1	
Main Street (Third to F	Rail Road Tracks)	н		\$1 221 115	¢1 E02 21E	Note 1	1	Developer
	Cost per Block (2016 dollars shown)		227.541	\$1,551,115	\$1,382,213	Note 1		Developer
	Number blocks		5					
	Total Cost (2016 dollars shown)		\$ 1,137,705					
Wastewater Project	n/a							
Water Project	WL Replacement			\$251,100		0%		
Storniwater Project	17.8							
Grant Street (Third to	Rail Road Tracks)			Å4.054.000	¢1 222 802		+	Doveloper
Grant Street (Third to	Cast and Black (2010 dollars shows)	п	227 541	\$1,064,892	\$1,255,692	Note 1		Developei
	Cost per Block (2016 dollars snown)		227,541					
	Tatal Cast (2010 dellars shows)		4					
Wastewater Project	n/a		\$ 510,104		·			
Water Project	WL Replacement			\$169,000		0%		
Stormwater Project	n/a							
Lincoln Street (First to	Second)	н		\$266,223	\$351,223	Note 1		Developer
	Cost per Block (2016 dollars shown)		227,541					
	Number blocks		1					
Mastauratas Desiant	Total Cost (2016 dollars shown)		\$ 227,541					
Wastewater Project	WI Replacement			\$85,000		0%		
Stormwater Project	n/a			+/				
-								
Harrison Street (First t	o Second)	н		\$266.223	\$351.223	Note 1		Developer
	Cost per Block (2016 dollars shown)		227,541					
	Number blocks		1					
	Total Cost (2016 dollars shown)		\$ 227,541					
Wastewater Project	n/a			¢85.000		0%		
Stormwater Project	wL Replacement			\$85,000		0%		
					·		1	
Sheridan (Rail Road tra	acks to 1/2 block east of Main)				\$484 334			
		н		\$399,334	Ş404,334	Note 1	City	Developer
	Cost per Block (2016 dollars shown)		227,541				Grant	
	Number blocks		1.5				Program	
Wastewator Project	i otal Cost (2016 dollars shown)		\$ 341,312				-	
Water Project	WI Replacement			\$85,000		0%	1	
Stormwater Project	n/a			000,000		070		
Sheridan (Edwards to	River)	н		\$798.669	\$798.669	Note 1	Citv	Developer
sheriuan (cuwarus to l	Cost per Block (2016 dollars shown)		227,541	50,007	<i>ç, 50,005</i>	1016 1	Sidewalk	
	Number blocks		3				Grant	
	Total Cost (2016 dollars shown)		\$ 682,623				Program	
Wastewater Project	n/a							
Water Project	n/a						<u> </u>	
Stormwater Project	11/ a				ļ		1	

Third (Grant to Blaine)	Cost per Block (2016 dollars shown)	н		227,541	\$1,064,892	\$1,064,892	Note 1	City Sidewalk	Developer
	Number blocks Total Cost (2016 dollars shown)		\$	4 910 164				Grant Program	
Wastewater Project	n/a		Ş	510,104					
Water Project Stormwater Project	n/a n/a								
Third (Howard to River	)	н			\$798,669	\$1,049,769	Note 1	City	Developer
	Cost per Block (2016 dollars shown) Number blocks			227,541 3				Grant	
	Total Cost (2016 dollars shown)		\$	682,623				Program	
Wastewater Project Water Project	n/a WL Replacement				\$251,100		0%		
Stormwater Project	n/a								
		<u>.</u>				<u> </u>			D
Sherman (School to Bla	ine) Cost per Block (2016 dollars shown)	п		227,541	\$1,597,338	\$1,682,338	Note 1		Developer
	Number blocks			6					
Wastewater Project	l otal Cost (2016 dollars shown) n/a		Ş	1,365,246					
Water Project	UL Replacement				\$85,000		0%		
Stormwater Project	n/a								
						+			
Blaine (Hancock to Thi	rd) Cost per Block (2016 dollars shown)	н	TSP Project #S10	225.000	\$789,750	\$960,123	15%		Developer
	Number blocks			3					
Wastewater Proiect	Total Cost (2016 dollars shown) n/a			\$675,000					
Water Project	- E First to E Third	н			\$170,373		0%		
Stormwater Project	n/a								
ADA Curb Ramps (DKS	) - S Blaine Street,	н				\$263,200	Note 1	ODOT Safe Boutes to	Developer
	- E First Street to E Third Street (2 blocks)				\$263,200			School	1
N College (Hwy 219) at Add South Bound Right	Hancock (Hwy 99) Intersection Improvement - t Turn Lane on N College	н				\$1,500,000			Developer
					\$1,500,000		Note 1		
N Blaine/E Hancock Sig	inal	н			\$909,000	\$909,000			
N Blaine/E First Signal		н			\$909,000	\$909,000			
S River Street Improve	ments - E First to E Third, +/-600 LF				\$574,394	\$829,006		ODOT Safe	
		н				9829,000	35%	Routes to	Developer
Wastewater Project	l&l #18				\$254,612		50%	501001	
Water Project Stormwater Project	n/a n/a								
Public Infrastructure	/Transportation Water Wastewater and Ste	rm)				\$41 436 906			
	e (mansportation, water, wastewater and sto	,				Ş41,430,300	C1 5 11 11	1	1
							Development	Grants	Other
Description							Charges % Eligible	Sourco	
Description							70 Eligible	Source	
SIGNAGE & WAYFINDI	NG					\$140.400			
	Streetscape & Wayfinding Plan	н				\$140,400	Note 1		
	East End Gateway	н				\$409,500	Note 1		
	Secondary Gateway Artwalk	н				\$140,400	Note 1		
	Wayfinding	н				\$350,000	Note 1		
	West End Gateway	н				\$393,900	Note 1		
	Northwest Gateway	н				\$135,100	Note 1		
	Total					\$1,686,300			
NORTH/SOUTH CONN		_							
NORTH/SOUTH CONN	North/South Refinement Study	н				\$117,000	Note 1		
	Total					£117 000			
	างเล					\$117,000		1	
DOWNTOWN TROLLEY	f 					607 750			
	I rolly Feasibility Study	н				\$87,750	Note 1		
	Total					\$87,750		1	

1						I		1	1
PARKING						<b>45 050</b>			
	Signage (yearly)	н				\$5,850	Note 1		
	Parking Data collection(Bi-annually)	н				\$35,100	Note 1		
	Business to Business Outreach	н				\$2,925	Note 1		
	Surface Parking		Estimated Spaces				Note 1		
	- 112 S Blaine Street	н	27			\$565,095			
	- 312 E Second Street	н	25			\$520,756			
	- 312 E Second Street	н	25			\$536,714			
	- 108 S Howard Street	н	25			\$524,493			
	- S Center / E Second Street	н	18			\$393,698			
	- 211 N School Street	н	10			\$131,300			
						. ,			
		Total	130			\$2,672,056			
	Second Street Parking Garage*						Note 1		
	Alt 1 3 Lovolc	н	100			\$2,070,500	Note 1		
	Alt 2 2 Levels	н	131			\$2,070,300			
	- Alt 2 2 Levels	н	160			\$2,712,333			
	Alt 2 2 Lovels	н	185			\$3,812,800			
	*Existing surface lot has 87 spaces		105			\$3,850,425			
				Estimated Cost Range of Secon	nd Street I	Parking Garage Alternatives			
				\$2,070,500	to	\$3,830,425			
	Total			\$4,786,431	to	\$6,546,356		<u> </u>	
TOTAL				\$6,677,481	to	\$8,437,406			
PEDESTRIAN FURNITU	JRE, TRASH CANS, ETC.								
	Benches First Street-12 Blocks, 4 per b	olock H				\$91,500	Note 1		
	Trash Cans First Street-12 Blocks, 4 per b	olock H				\$84,100	Note 1		
	Total					\$17E 600			
	Total					\$175,600			
BUILDING FACADE PR	OGRAM	н				\$500,000	Note 1		State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO)
	Total					\$500.000			
SECOND STREET UTIL	ITY UNDERGROUNDING								
DKS	Grant to River	н				\$1,833,200	Note 1		
-	Tetel					¢1 022 200			
	Total					\$1,833,200	Note 1:		
								Project not i of Newberg Mas	n a current City Infrastructure ter Plan
						-	Note2:	Project in	2016 TSP, No
Public Infrastructur	e (Transportation,Water, Wastewater a	and Storm)				\$41,436,906		aaaea	capacity.
SIGNAGE & WAYEIN	NDING NORTH/SOUTH CONNECTIONS								
DOWNTOWN TROL	LEY, PARKING*			\$6,677,481	to	\$8,437,406			
PEDESTRIAN FURNI	TURE, TRASH CANS, ETC.					\$175,600			
BUILDING FACADE	PROGRAM					\$500,000			
SECOND STREET UT	ILITY UNDERGROUNDING					\$1.833.200			
			Sub Area H						
Downtown Impro	ovement Plan Area Project Costs*			\$50,623,187	to	\$52,383,112			
	* Includes cost estimate range for the Sec	ond Street Parkina (	Garaae alternatives.	-					

4



DATE: November 2, 2020
TO: Doug Rux, City of Newberg
FROM: Nick Popenuk and Ali Danko
SUBJECT: PROPOSED NEWBERG URBAN RENEWAL AREA: ASSESSED VALUE GROWTH ASSUMPTIONS

The City of Newberg is considering the establishment of a new urban renewal area (URA). The proposed Area would encompass downtown Newberg, a portion of the Newberg Riverfront, and selected rights-of-way connecting these two subareas. This memorandum identifies the recommended growth rate for future growth in assessed value in the Area. This recommendation is based on historical trends, an evaluation of potential growth rate forecasts, and discussions between the Consultant Team and City staff, regarding the amount of future development potential in the Area.

# **Historical Growth**

Exhibit 1 and Exhibit 2 show the real market value and assessed value in Yamhill County and the City of Newberg from FYE 2007 through FYE 2020. During this period, the City's assessed value increased at a compound annual growth rate of 4.8%, whereas real market value increased at a rate of 4.9%.

		Yamhill	County		City of Newberg						
	Real Market V	alue	Assessed Val	ue	Real Market V	/alue	Assessed Val	ue			
FYE	Value	%	Value	Value %		%	Value	%			
2007	\$ 9,138,140,279		\$5,518,366,368		\$1,905,225,704		\$1,110,866,040				
2008	\$10,321,298,356	12.9%	\$ 5,779,076,696	4.7%	\$2,268,613,601	19.1%	\$1,193,170,105	7.4%			
2009	\$10,751,680,077	4.2%	\$6,210,309,816	7.5%	\$2,239,316,374	-1.3%	\$1,271,921,638	6.6%			
2010	\$10,403,608,875	-3.2%	\$6,486,735,797	4.5%	\$2,187,831,882	-2.3%	\$1,364,210,006	7.3%			
2011	\$10,206,294,681	-1.9%	\$6,741,783,234	3.9%	\$2,193,902,961	0.3%	\$1,441,923,513	5.7%			
2012	\$ 9,189,326,981	-10.0%	\$6,823,878,089	1.2%	\$1,956,379,200	-10.8%	\$1,479,778,703	2.6%			
2013	\$ 8,911,055,976	-3.0%	\$7,028,886,974	3.0%	\$1,912,302,698	-2.3%	\$1,529,465,962	3.4%			
2014	\$ 9,156,128,373	2.8%	\$7,241,524,240	3.0%	\$1,929,918,978	0.9%	\$1,546,167,978	1.1%			
2015	\$ 9,699,390,529	5.9%	\$7,525,262,079	3.9%	\$2,103,273,498	9.0%	\$1,627,595,461	5.3%			
2016	\$10,303,700,251	6.2%	\$7,934,419,267	5.4%	\$2,199,658,073	4.6%	\$1,696,556,938	4.2%			
2017	\$11,429,249,833	10.9%	\$8,277,825,435	4.3%	\$2,380,377,182	8.2%	\$1,780,615,477	5.0%			
2018	\$15,235,167,500	33.3%	\$8,619,949,331	4.1%	\$2,885,994,061	21.2%	\$1,855,195,227	4.2%			
2019	\$16,642,417,818	9.2%	\$9,023,496,200	4.7%	\$3,124,480,898	8.3%	\$1,904,718,781	2.7%			
2020	\$17,991,021,537	8.1%	\$9,540,085,159	5.7%	\$3,555,696,446	13.8%	\$2,037,958,279	7.0%			
CAGR		5.3%		4.3%		4.9%		4.8%			

Exhibit 1. Value History, Yamhill County and City of Newberg, FYE 2007 to FYE 2020

Source: Yamhill County Assessor

For real market value, the impacts of the "Great Recession" of 2008 can be seen in FYE 2010 through FYE 2013. Real market values countywide and citywide fell significantly during this period, including a loss of over \$300 million in real market value in the City of Newberg. Beginning with FYE 2014, the City and County have experienced strong growth in real market value. Over a period of just seven years, real market value countywide in FYE 2020 had doubled since its recessionary low-point in FYE 2013.

Annual changes in assessed value are much less volatile than changes in real market value. Assessed values countywide and citywide continued to increase each year during the aftermath of the Great Recession,

albeit at a slower pace. Similarly, the massive growth in real market value in the region has translated to more slow and steady gains in assessed value during the post-recessionary years. This dynamic is due to Oregon's property tax system, which separates real market values from assessed values, and limits annual growth in assessed value to just 3.0% per year in most situations, barring new construction of other "exception events."





# **Future Growth Forecast**

City staff identified dozens of anticipated and potential development opportunities within the proposed URA boundary. These development opportunities include:

- Residential development in the Riverfront Area, including hundreds of new housing units, both apartments and single-family homes.
- WestRock Mill site redevelopment, including the potential for over one million square feet of industrial construction, a 20-acre corporate campus, and additional commercial and mixed-use development.
- Downtown development and redevelopment, including commercial, residential, and mixed-use opportunities.
- West End Mill District redevelopment, with potential for a hotel, restaurant, brewpub/distillery/wine tasting, and produce market.
- Dozens of other smaller scale development opportunities on vacant and underutilized lots in the Area.

Tiberius Solutions identified four potential assessed value growth rate scenarios, based on the list of potential development and a review of historical trends in the City and County. These scenarios include:

 Conservative: 4% average annual growth. Less than long-term growth trends for the City or County.

- Somewhat conservative: 5% average annual growth. Similar growth rate to long-term citywide trend that does not reflect substantial development opportunities in the Area.
- Somewhat aggressive: 6% average annual growth: Higher growth than long-term trends for the City or County, reflecting the substantial development opportunities in the Area.
- Aggressive: 7% average annual growth: Higher growth than long-term trends for the City or County, which would require most of the potential development opportunities to come to fruition during the forecast period.

Exhibit 3 summarizes the financial capacity of the proposed URA based on each of the four potential growth scenarios described above. Key figures shown in this table include:

- Average annual exception assessed value (2020 \$). The average amount of new assessed value that would need to be added to the tax rolls each year from new construction (on top of assumed 3.0% annual appreciation of existing property values) to achieve the assumed growth rate. Ranges from \$1.7 million per year in the conservative scenario, to \$11.7 million per year in the aggressive scenario.
- **Total net tax increment finance (TIF) revenue**. The total amount of property tax revenue the URA would be expected to collect over an assumed 30-year duration for a new urban renewal plan. Ranges from \$59.3 million in the conservative scenario, to \$154.3 million in the aggressive scenario.
- **Maximum indebtedness**. The principal amount of indebtedness that is expected to be incurred over the life of the URA, based on the forecast TIF revenue. This figure is lower than total TIF, as a portion of TIF revenue is assumed to be spent on interest payments on debt incurred in the Area. Ranges from \$50.3 million in the conservative scenario to \$132.8 million in the aggressive scenario.
- **Capacity (2020 \$)**. The value of projects that could be funded by the URA as stated in today's (2020) dollars, after accounting for the impact of inflation. This figure is lower than maximum indebtedness, because much of the urban renewal funding is not available for many years, resulting in a significant amount of inflation that reduces the purchasing power of the URA over time. Ranges from \$27.9 million in the conservative scenario to \$71.1 million in the aggressive scenario.

Growth Rate		4%		<b>5%</b>	6%		7%
Avg Annual Exception AV (2020 \$)	\$	1,700,000	\$	4,100,000	\$ 7,400,000	\$	11,700,000
Total Net TIF	<b>\$</b> 5	59,300,000	\$	84,400,000	\$ 115,900,000	<b>\$</b>	154,300,000
Maximum Indebtedness	<b>\$</b> 5	50,300,000	<b>\$</b>	72,000,000	\$ 99,300,000	<b>\$</b>	132,800,000
Capacity (2020 \$)	\$2	27,900,000	<b>\$</b> 2	39,400,000	\$ 53,700,000	\$	71,100,000
Years 1-5	\$	2,500,000	\$	3,300,000	\$ 4,000,000	\$	4,800,000
Years 6-10	\$	3,900,000	\$	5,100,000	\$ 6,600,000	\$	8,100,000
Years 11-15	\$	5,100,000	\$	7,000,000	\$ 9,200,000	\$	11,900,000
Years 16-20	\$	5,200,000	\$	7,500,000	\$ 10,200,000	\$	13,700,000
Years 21-25	\$	5,400,000	\$	8,000,000	\$ 11,300,000	\$	15,600,000
Years 26-30	\$	5,700,000	\$	8,500,000	\$ 12,400,000	\$	17,100,000

# Exhibit 3. Financial Capacity Summary Based on Potential Assessed Value Growth Rate Assumptions, Proposed Newberg URA

Source: Tiberius Solutions

After reviewing and discussing this analysis with City staff, the Consultant Team recommends that the proposed urban renewal plan assume 6.0% average annual growth in assessed value. This somewhat aggressive assumption is higher than the long-term historical trends observed for either the City or County. However, the substantial development opportunities identified in the Area provide justification for achieving this growth rate. Note that this is an assumed average growth rate. In reality, the Area will experience some years with lower growth (when less development occurs), and some years with higher growth (when more development occurs).

Achieving a 6.0% growth rate in assessed value will require an average of \$7.4 million (2020 \$) of new assessed value to be added to the tax rolls from new construction each year. Redevelopment of the WestRock Mill site at some point during the life of the proposed URA will be critical to achieving the long-term growth shown in this scenario.