



**City of McMinnville**  
**Planning Department**  
231 NE Fifth Street  
McMinnville, OR 97128  
(503) 434-7311

[www.mcminnvilleoregon.gov](http://www.mcminnvilleoregon.gov)

# MINUTES

---

**November 2, 2016**  
**McMinnville Urban Renewal Advisory Committee**  
**Regular Meeting**

**4:00 p.m.**  
**Community Development Center**  
**McMinnville, Oregon**

**Members Present:** Kyle Faulk, Cassie Sollars, Wendy Stassens, Marilyn Worrix  
**Members Absent:** Ed Gormley, Walt Gowell, and Kelly McDonald  
**Ex-Officios Present:** Kem Carr, Scott Hill and Rebecca Quandt  
**Staff Present:** Marcia Baragary, Mike Bisset, Candace Haines, and Heather Richards  
**Guests Present:** Kellie Menke, Jared Miller, and Steven Rupp

---

## 1. Call to Order/Introductions

Vice Chair Faulk called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

## 2. Action Docket Item(s)

### A. Parking Study Proposal

Planning Director Heather Richards said the Committee had asked staff to solicit a proposal from Rick Williams Consulting to do an analysis of parking capacity based on existing conditions and based on future build conditions and future inventory sites. The consultant would look at both the downtown area and the northeast gateway district. The consultant came back with a proposal not to exceed \$27,026 for the work, although she thought that could be negotiated. The analysis would be done by February and the proposal would go to the Urban Renewal Agency Board for approval.

Committee Member Worrix asked if the Committee would be kept apprised of the work and would have some input or would they only see the final document. She thought the Committee should be in the loop before the final product was finished. Planning Director Richards replied it was deliberate not to have a public discussion about their analysis so the normal behaviors would not be tainted. After tasks 2 and 3 there were deliverables of technical memorandums that the Committee could review and respond to. The Committee could also choose to have the technical memorandum for future inventory sites be confidential, such as whether to identify specific lots or have general areas of

need. They could build in discussions with the consultant and MURAC to give the consultant more feedback.

Vice Chair Faulk thought satellite parking should also be explored as there were properties available for it and there was an opportunity to provide shuttle service supported by the businesses. The Committee agreed satellite parking could help with the parking problem.

Ex-officio Member Quandt said parking was very different on a Saturday than it was on a Tuesday and thought the study should include more than one day.

Planning Director Richards confirmed another day could be added to the study. She explained how the consultant would determine the parking needs through the City's code. He would look at density and parking standards and use a formula for a percentage of overall capacity in terms of density for full development. The consultant would also be looking at where the public and private parking lots were, typical parking needs, and where shared parking agreements could be made.

Committee Member Worrix moved to recommend approval of the parking study to the Urban Renewal Agency Board for an amount not to exceed \$35,000. The motion was seconded by Committee Member Stassens and approved 4-0.

## B. Wayfinding Proposal

Planning Director Richards said Visit McMinnville had put together a committee to look at wayfinding City-wide. They met with Sea Reach who did this kind of work and had asked them to submit a proposal. There was discussion to fund this through partnerships. The potential partners were the Urban Renewal Agency, City of McMinnville, Visit McMinnville, and MEDP. The total amount for the project was \$24,000 and Urban Renewal's portion would be \$6,000 to \$8,000. The intention was to apply for a grant with Travel Oregon for the product and implementation.

Ex-officio Member Hill said the Visit McMinnville group thought there should be the same type of signs throughout the City. They were looking at a colorful and informational way without a lot of words to help people go where they wanted to go.

Ex-officio Member Carr was concerned about justifying the percentage that would come from MEDP. He thought it was a stretch for MEDP to pay a large amount. Once the plan was in place, was it implied that the percentage would be the same for all partners for the installation and construction?

Planning Director Richards agreed that there should be proportionality and that the MEDP would provide a smaller piece than other partners. Regarding the overall implementation, there had not been discussions about proportionality or requiring the same share for all the partners. Urban Renewal funds would have to be spent for projects within the Urban Renewal District. It would be their choice for how big or small they would

implement the plan. There would be units per product that could be purchased and the consultant would recommend locations. The signs might be installed in phases due to cost.

Committee Member Stassens moved to recommend approval of the wayfinding proposal to the Urban Renewal Agency Board for an amount of up to \$8,000. The motion was seconded by Committee Member Worrix and passed 4-0.

Community Development Director Mike Bissett said the bid opening for the Alpine project happened last week. Four bids had been received with a range of \$4.4 million to \$5.4 million. Unfortunately the available funds for the project were \$3.4 million. The cost difference had to do with the architectural features that were chosen, stormwater planters, streetscape furnishing items, and steel planter walls. There were some significant concerns by the contractors regarding some of the material choices within the street pallet, such as the street pavers and concrete finishing. Staff proposed to decline all the bids and rework the design to fit the aesthetic intent and to fit within the budget parameters. He would bring back the revised design to the next MURAC meeting. After the revised design had been approved, the project would go back out to bid. Other options besides the pavers were stamped concrete or decorative scoring in the concrete. The goal was to achieve the same design aesthetic, but at an affordable price.

Planning Director Richards said the Urban Renewal loan did finance and was in the bank.

### **3. Discussion Item(s)**

#### Capital Improvement Project Discussion

Planning Director Richards said this was a follow-up discussion from the last MURAC meeting. It was planning for the next five years including the next big project that could be bonded in 2022 and strategic investments. They had talked about the large public improvement projects that were in the plan and the duality of those with the transportation bond and what the bond would be paying for. Community Development Director Bissett would explain some of the projects that were moving forward with the transportation bond and the timing so they could see if they wanted to partner on some of the projects and do some more effects to them or to time projects so downtown was not under construction for the next five years.

Community Development Director Bissett reviewed the 5<sup>th</sup> Street project. The contract was awarded for the project and most of the traffic signal bases had been poured. The signal portion of the project should be completed by early next year. The roadway reconstruction between Evans and Lafayette would be done by May 2017. The project did not include streetscape improvements, furnishings, or lighting. He thought a pedestrian lighting or streetscape project along 5<sup>th</sup> Street would have to be a separate project as most of the bulb outs had already been poured. He did not think it was beneficial to try to add on to the current project. Decorative lights were being put in on Evans and Lafayette that matched the lights on 3<sup>rd</sup>. They could not put them on Adams and Baker because it was a state highway and was not allowed. The signal facilities would be black to match the design elements.

Regarding the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Street improvements, the transportation bond included curb extensions at major intersections. They were just starting the design for the project and the target for construction was summer 2018. The project would also include repaving of both streets and intersection improvements. He could have the design team look at lighting enhancements on the corridors, but they might be better served to look at a full corridor lighting project that included the gaps between intersections. Regarding traffic signals, it did not meet the signal warrants at this time for a traffic signal.

Vice Chair Faulk asked if the reconstruction project should include conduit for a future lighting project. Community Development Director Bissett said it would be hard to know where to put the conduit if they did not know where the lights were going to go. He could pose the question to the consultants, but there was no lighting plan and there was overhead power in this area. A future project to add lighting made sense and they would not be saving time or effort trying to figure it out now.

Planning Director Richards said regarding the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Street project, what would be done for crosswalk delineation. Community Development Director Bissett said the delineation would most likely be done when the curb extensions were done. On those intersections that did not have curb extensions, the pedestrians would have to be more aware of their surroundings. The stripes did not affect driver behavior and sometimes gave pedestrians a false sense of security. These streets had issues with pedestrian accidents and the curb extensions would open up the view corridor for pedestrians and motorists and where appropriate the crosswalk markings would be placed.

Planning Director Richards asked about flower plantings on the bulb outs and irrigation. Community Development Director Bissett said the flower baskets on the poles were irrigated. He could also bring that question to the design team.

Community Development Director Bissett discussed the 2<sup>nd</sup> Street project between Adams and Cows to address traffic congestion. They were at 60% design on the project with a target of going to bid in the first quarter of 2017 and construction to occur in the summer/fall of 2017. It included redesign of 2<sup>nd</sup> Street west of Adams Street and the block between Adams and Baker would be widened to add a second left turn lane. There was no room for lighting or landscaping in that block. The area between Cows and Baker would have a right turn lane added. There was space for landscaping and pedestrian lighting there. He could share some of the design concepts with the consultants. There would be landscape islands on both ends of the project. The contractor would do the hardscape and create the spaces and MURAC could be involved in what the landscaping should look like. The 5<sup>th</sup> Street project would be completed before the 2<sup>nd</sup> Street project started and 2<sup>nd</sup> Street would be completed before the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Street project began.

Planning Director Richards confirmed that where Urban Renewal could have an opportunity to create a higher sense of place was the flower planters and irrigation on the bulb outs on 2<sup>nd</sup> Street, nothing on 5<sup>th</sup> Street at this time, and wayfinding signs could help with the area between Adams and Baker to create a sense of place. Outside of these and public parking, the 3<sup>rd</sup> Street streetscape was the next immediate project and then pedestrian connectivity between Adams and Baker.

Community Development Director Bissett intended to improve the crossing on 3<sup>rd</sup> Street to Adams as part of the transportation bond. In ODOT's most recent round of projects there was scoping for a program they called ARTS, All Roads Transportation Safety program. In that project they scoped doing some curb extensions along Adams and Baker between 2<sup>nd</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup>. That project did not make the list for this round of funding, but it was an opportunity to work with ODOT in the future. The transportation bond projects would be done by 2020.

Planning Director Richards thought they should look at the timing for the 3<sup>rd</sup> Street project and create a process for putting together the overall designs and what had already been done as well as public outreach. The project was a couple of years out still, but they needed to start the first steps.

Vice Chair Faulk thought any infrastructure improvements that needed to be made should not be left undone so the street had to be worked on again.

Ex-officio Member Carr suggested electric meter relocations on landscape facilities and irrigation water meters as part of the project.

Planning Director Richards would put together a list of steps for the project and bring it back to the next meeting. She would also be bringing back a proposal for a Redevelopment Loan/Grant Program.

#### **4. Citizen Comments**

None.

#### **5. Committee Member Comments**

None.

#### **6. Staff Comments**

Planning Director Richards stated MEDP was putting together a program on December 8 for potential investors in the northeast gateway district and she and Chair Gowell would be talking to them about Urban Renewal and what was available.

#### **7. Adjournment**

Vice Chair Faulk adjourned the meeting at 5:08 p.m.