

1 Depoe Bay Urban Renewal Agency
2 Regular Meeting
3 Tuesday, March 21, 2017 6:00 PM
4 Depoe Bay City Hall

5
6 PRESENT: Chair R. Johnson, D. Callender, R. Gambino, L. Goddard, Mayor B. Leff, B. Spores,
7 J. Wiseman

8
9 ABSENT: C. Bates, J. Grant

10
11 STAFF: City Recorder M. Meagher, City Superintendent B. Weidner, Recording Secretary
12 E. LuMaye, City Planner L. Lewis

13
14 I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER AND ESTABLISH A QUORUM

15 Chair Johnson called the Urban Renewal meeting to order and established a quorum at 6:00 PM.

16
17 II. APPROVE MINUTES March 7, 2017 Regular Meeting

18 Chair Johnson asked for a motion to approve the minutes of the March 7, 2017 meeting.

19
20 Motion: Mayor Leff so moved. Goddard seconded the motion.

21
22 Chair Johnson said it was moved and seconded, and called for comments; there were none.

23
24 Vote: Motion passed.

25 Ayes: Callender, Gambino, Goddard, Johnson, Leff, Spores, Wiseman

26
27 III. REVIEW GRANT APPLICATIONS – Preservation, Rehabilitation, Development, and
28 Re-Development Incentive Program (Brady and Larry)

- 29 • Describe Each Proposed Project
30 • Note Whether Applications Meet Requirements
31 • Evaluate Meeting of Urban Renewal Objectives

32 Chair Johnson thanked Lewis for putting together the review packet (copy attached to original of
33 these minutes). Because one of the applications was from the Fire District, Mayor Leff declared she
34 is on the Fire District’s board; there was no objection to her participating in the review. Lewis
35 reviewed each application for compliance with Urban Renewal objectives and level of need: All
36 applications (Depoe Bay Fire District, Germaneri, Gnuschke, Newell, Petersen, and Woodmark) met
37 the criterion of “obsolescence, deterioration, dilapidation, mixed character, or shifting of uses”.
38 Germaneri’s application additionally met the criterion of “an economic dislocation, deterioration, or
39 disuse of property resulting from faulty planning. Petersen’s application additionally met the criteria
40 of: 1) the laying out of property/lots in disregard of contours, drainage, other physical characteristics
41 of terrain and surrounding conditions” and 2) “a prevalence of depreciated values, impaired
42 investments, and social and economic maladjustments to such an extent that the capacity to pay taxes
43 is reduced and tax receipts are inadequate for the cost of public services rendered” and 3) “a growing
44 or total lack of proper utilization of areas, resulting in a stagnant and unproductive condition of land
45 potentially useful and valuable for contributing to the public health, safety, and welfare”. There was
46 discussion about each of the applications, and potentially adding conditions for approval.

47

1 IV. PRELIMINARY DECISIONS ON APPLICATIONS

- 2 • Accept, Rank, and Schedule Projects
3 • Schedule Meeting for Applicant Presentations and Final Decisions

4 Chair Johnson said if the Agency was in agreement that all applications received meet Urban
5 Renewal requirements, there would be no need to have the applicants come before the Agency. There
6 was discussion about the total dollar amount being requested and the timeline of paying out grant
7 monies as relates to the current year Budget as well as upcoming Budgets for the next year or two.
8 Chair Johnson suggested that the grant application window scheduled for July be postponed until
9 January, 2018 due to the number of acceptable applications that have been received. Meagher noted
10 the Program outline says once the grant is awarded, the recipient has to start the repairs within six
11 months, and complete them within 18 months. She said her concern was if grants are awarded two-to-
12 three years out, the applicants will go past the deadline.

13
14 Motion: Mayor Leff moved that we accept all of these applications as viable, and work out the year
15 and the funding of them offline, and then approve them as we decide how the funding streams will be
16 timed. Callender seconded the motion.

17
18 Chair Johnson said it was moved and seconded, and called for discussion. There was brief discussion.

19
20 Vote: Motion passed.

21 Ayes: Callender, Gambino, Goddard, Johnson, Leff, Spores, Wiseman
22

23 There was further discussion regarding postponing the next round of applications until January; this
24 subject will be revisited at a later date.
25

26 V. RECONSIDER BUDGET NUMBERS – Dilapidated Wharf Restoration Project

- 27 • Costs (Brady)
28 • Time Allowed After Removal (Larry)

29 Weidner said the contractor has quoted \$33,500 for total removal, cleanup, haul-off, and installation
30 of a guardrail between the street and the seawall by the dilapidated wharf (copy of Estimate attached
31 to original of these minutes). Lewis will have the information on length of time allowed for
32 redevelopment after removal of the wharf by the next meeting. Chair Johnson said there is \$100,000
33 in the Budget for this, and suggested holding another meeting in two weeks. Goddard reiterated his
34 statement from the previous meeting that the wharf was built with private money for a business
35 enterprise, and it's not in his opinion incumbent on the City to replace it, particularly with Urban
36 Renewal dollars. He asked Lewis if work on the wharf would be considered in-water when it can be
37 done out of water at low tide; Lewis will find out and report at the next meeting. Chair Johnson
38 clarified that the motion included direction for Staff to send out letters to each of the applicants
39 informing them what the Agency has agreed to.
40

41 VII. ADJOURN

42 There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:58 PM
43
44

45
46 _____
Richard Johnson, Chair

47 _____
48 Emma LuMaye, Recording Secretary