

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

5  
6 PRESENT: Chair R. Johnson, C. Bates, R. Gambino (left at 6:50 PM), L. Goddard, J. Grant,  
7 Mayor B. Leff, B. Spores, J. Wiseman

8  
9 ABSENT: D. Callender

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 21, 2017 Regular Meeting

18 Chair Johnson asked for a motion to approve the minutes of the March 21, 2017 meeting.

19  
20 Motion 1: Mayor Leff moved to approve the minutes as submitted. Gambino 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: Bates, Gambino, Goddard, Grant, Johnson, Leff, Spores, Wiseman

26  
27 III. BANK SIGNATURE CHANGES

28 Meagher said the minutes need to reflect that Murray has been removed as a signer on the account,  
29 and Meagher has been added, in order for the bank to make that authorization. There was brief  
30 discussion.

31  
32 IV. PRESERVATION, REHABILITATION, DEVELOPMENT, AND RE-DEVELOPMENT  
33 INCENTIVE PROGRAM

34 • Completion/Payment Schedules (Larry)

35 Chair Johnson thanked Lewis for contacting the applicants, and drew attention to Lewis' proposed  
36 Completion/Payment Schedule (copy attached to original of these minutes), which proposed funding  
37 the Fire District's \$50,000 project in the current 2016-17 fiscal year, and funding the remaining five  
38 applications' projects totaling \$151,383 in the upcoming 2017-18 fiscal year. Lewis reported he was  
39 asked to confirm the completion dates of the projects, and spoke with five of the six applicants; a  
40 couple of them changed their completion dates from what was in their applications. He said  
41 reimbursement is done when a project is complete and Urban Renewal cannot reimburse for work  
42 done prior to agreements being in place, and he told this to the five applicants he spoke with.

43  
44 • Fiscal Year Budgets

45 Chair Johnson recommended sticking with the proposed budget of \$150,000 for fiscal year 2017-18,  
46 and we can handle going over budget by a few dollars. There was lengthy discussion regarding 1) the  
47 interpretation of the motion to accept the applications that was made at the previous meeting, 2) the  
48 Agency has the option of awarding a lesser amount than requested, and 3) awarding applications

1 based on the particular year of the request, and not awarding applications for projects that won't be  
2 complete before the next open application period. Meagher said applicants must begin their project  
3 within six months, and complete it within 18 months, so projects awarded for an upcoming fiscal year  
4 may not qualify if they won't be complete in 18 months. Chair Johnson asked for a motion to approve  
5 the applications for the amount of money presented. Gambino asked for clarification that the Chair  
6 was suggesting awarding the entire amount of \$201,383; Chair Johnson said he was. He wanted to  
7 put the projects into the budget for the fiscal year in which they would be paid. Gambino did not  
8 agree with that, and suggested putting a maximum dollar amount on the total amount the Agency  
9 approves or otherwise awards in each application period. Mayor Leff suggested establishing a  
10 subcommittee to meet with Lewis and set up criteria. Meagher said \$50,000 is what has been  
11 budgeted to be awarded this fiscal year, and other funds would be in the next fiscal year and would  
12 not apply to these applications. Grant pointed out that while all the applications met the criteria, a  
13 lesser amount of funding could be awarded on any application.

14  
15 • Next Request for Applications

16 Chair Johnson maintained funding for the applications which were accepted at the previous meeting  
17 could be handled in the next fiscal year, and suggested not going out for applications on July 1  
18 because the funding is already designated, but to wait until January 1, 2018. Mayor Leff urgently  
19 recommended putting together a small Committee to sit down and work out not only criteria for  
20 whether or not applications are accepted, but also criteria to figure out how much money will be  
21 awarded.

22  
23 Motion 2: Goddard so moved. Grant seconded the motion.

24  
25 Chair Johnson said it was moved and seconded, and called for comments. It was noted the Committee  
26 would report to the Agency.

27  
28 Vote: Motion passed.

29 Ayes: Bates, Gambino, Goddard, Grant, Johnson, Leff, Spores, Wiseman

30  
31 Committee members will be Lewis, Meagher, Chair Johnson, Grant, and Gambino.

32  
33 V. DILAPIDATED WHARF RESTORATION PROJECT

34 Lewis reviewed his memo dated 3/23/17 (copy attached to original of these minutes), noting if the  
35 City decided to remove the wharf at this time but delayed in replacing it, that careful measurements  
36 and photos would need to be taken of the existing wharf, because if the City came back to replace the  
37 wharf at a later date and it was any larger than the existing wharf, there would be litigation. Mayor  
38 Leff said the next step would be to recommend to City Council that the wharf be removed; Chair  
39 Johnson would recommend to the City that we move forward with a permit application for removal  
40 and replacement of the wharf. Weidner said he had a contractor's quote to remove the wharf for  
41 \$33,500, and to rebuild it would be \$250,000. Grant said the City has wants and the City has needs;  
42 the City wants to replace the wharf, but the City needs to replace the docks. Chair Johnson said the  
43 Agency did put up money for Docks 2, 3, and 4 engineering and study; but the Agency's overall  
44 objective is to remove blight and removal of the wharf fits that category. Goddard concurred with  
45 Grant that the more pressing need was the docks, but he was also very concerned with the position of  
46 liability that the derelict wharf puts the City in, and we should investigate removing the wharf at the  
47 quoted cost. Chair Johnson asked Agency Members to differentiate between the City's needs and  
48 Urban Renewal objectives; they are different, and the wharf fits into Urban Renewal more than

1 Docks 2, 3, and 4. Lewis clarified the Agency could spend \$750 on the application for just removal,  
2 or we could spend \$750 for removal and replacement and if the replacement is delayed the permit  
3 could be renewed at a cost of a few hundred dollars. Grant said the close-to-40-year-old docks fit the  
4 definition of blight because they are at the end of their useful life; and there have been Urban  
5 Renewal projects in the past that in his opinion didn't fit the criteria. He said replacing the docks is  
6 closer to the prime directive of the Agency than anything.

7  
8 Motion 3: Grant moved that we approve \$35,000 for the removal of those docks and recommend it to  
9 the City Council, and go ahead with the permit process, and go along with the information as outlined  
10 by our City Planner Larry Lewis that we go for the removal and replacement, and for a few hundred  
11 dollars each year we can keep kicking the can down the road until we're ready to replace it. Gambino  
12 seconded the motion.

13  
14 Chair Johnson said it was moved and seconded, and called for comments. The motion was restated  
15 for clarification, and it was noted that while the word "docks" was used the word "wharf" was meant.  
16 Lewis clarified that if the permit applied for is for removal and replacement, engineering drawings  
17 will likely be required to be submitted, and that cost should be factored in.

18  
19 Grant withdrew his motion.

20  
21 Motion 4: Grant moved that we get an application to remove the docks, document the dimensions  
22 with pictures and any way that we can document it – even with GPS – the corners and whatever we  
23 need to do so it's well recorded; and that we get the permit for removal. Mayor Leff asked if what  
24 Grant meant to say was that we recommend to the Council that Council gets the permit; Grant  
25 affirmed. Goddard seconded the motion.

26  
27 Chair Johnson said it was moved and seconded, and called for comments. Weidner's input was  
28 requested; he strongly suggested a guard rail, and said we could document with GPS and lasers.  
29 Meagher was asked to read the motion on the table: motion to recommend to Council to approve  
30 \$35,000 for removal of the wharf, and to get a permit for removal only, and to take pictures and  
31 measurements. Chair Johnson clarified the \$35,000 would be budgeted in the next fiscal year because  
32 the 120-day period to get the permit would come right up to the next fiscal year. There was brief  
33 discussion regarding Urban Renewal Budget vs City Budget.

34  
35 Vote: Motion 4 passed.

36 Ayes: Bates, Gambino, Goddard, Grant, Johnson, Leff, Spores, Wiseman

## 37 38 VI. STATUS REPORTS

- 39 • Hwy 101 South of Bridge/Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) Statewide  
40 Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Project

41 Chair Johnson asked Lewis for an update on the Hwy 101 project. Lewis reported he and Meagher  
42 talked about going to the Council in two weeks with a draft Agreement between ODOT and the City  
43 for the start of that project, and that Staff has recommendations for change that they will want to go  
44 over with the Agency, but it's not ready for the Agency tonight. An Agency meeting was scheduled  
45 for 6:30 PM on April 18 to present the draft and recommended changes.

- 46
- 47 • Parking Acquisition Project
- 48 • Coast Avenue Infrastructure Improvements Project

- 1 • Harbor Docks 2, 3, 4 Project

2  
3 Chair Johnson skipped the remaining status reports.

4  
5 VII. 2017-2018 Budget Recommendations

6 Chair Johnson recommended, based on information Lewis provided that might change, that we put up  
7 \$77,000 of the matching money for south of the bridge next year; reduce wharf removal to \$50,000;  
8 leave renovation and rehabilitation at \$150,000 until the Committee meets; leave parking at  
9 \$100,000; leave Docks 2, 3, and 4 at \$100,000. He asked for a motion. There was brief discussion.

10  
11 VII. ADJOURN

12 There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:51 PM

13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18 \_\_\_\_\_  
Richard Johnson, Chair

19  
20  
21  
22 \_\_\_\_\_  
23 Emma LuMaye, Recording Secretary