

MINUTES
CAP Advisory Committee
September 23, 2008

1. Roll Call

The regular meeting of the Central Area Plan Advisory Committee was called to order at 5:04 p.m. Members present upon roll call were: Jeff Eager, Bob Dempster, Jean Wood, ML Vidas, Pat Kesgard and Bob Thomas.

Robin Vora arrived at 5:14

2. Approval of Minutes

(March 25, 2008, June 24, 2008)

Member Thomas moved approval of the March 25th and June 24th minutes with Member Wood seconding the motion, which passed unanimously.

3. Update on Sale of Bend Bulletin Site

Mr. Russell announced the site did not sell; there were no offers. The message being heard was the price was too high, especially with the market being down. The city was hoping to recover their holding costs. He felt if the site is held for several years the costs may not be recouped and the debt comes due in 2010. It is not an immediate crisis, but is costing money. Member Kesgard asked if it ties up the city's bonding capacity and Mr. Russell replied not really. Member Wood did some comps and found the only land on the market was a smaller piece in the \$30/sf range and Member Kesgard commented there will be less and less demand as the market gets worse.

Mr. Russell said the city expected some offers, but received none. Member Eager asked if the plan is to provide Council with options and what will be suggested and Mr. Russell replied he will talk it through with Mr. King and Ms. Andrews. Member Eager wanted to know if there was a tie to BURA and Mr. Russell responded the site is outside the district boundary. Member Kesgard suggested that the city be very clear in their offering on what offsite mitigations need to be made and what the costs for those would be. Mr. Russell commented that did not seem to be a major issue, but there has been some talk about a pump station and traffic mitigation issues. Member Vidas hoped there would be some limits on the sale that would encourage development right away versus just holding the site for a time. Mr. Russell said anything can be negotiated in the sale agreement. Further discussion followed about the value of the site. Member Eager asked when this goes to Council and Mr. Russell was not sure, but within the next month or so.

4. Downtown Parking Management Update

Mr. Datwyler gave the committee an overview of other Advisory Board responsibilities. He described the three alternatives for parking downtown given to Council and their request that the Greenwood/Wall lot remain open for customer and employee parking at \$1.00/hour. The Pay and Display system was delivered this week for the Mirror Pond lots and will be functioning for the holiday season. Another issue discussed was the

chronic employee abuse of the system. Mr. Russell added that parking revenues are up. Member Dempster suggested tripling or quadrupling the fines. Mr. Datwyler explained that Councilor Capell is very interested in this issue and met with the Downtowners' Board and a tentative escalating fine structure was set up. Mr. Datwyler announced a Council work session on October 15 to discuss this issue.

Mr. Datwyler noted that based on a national study the loss of one parking space due to employee parking could be as much as a \$30,000 loss of revenue annually. Member Kesgard was supportive of new fine structure and asked if the other Councilors were in agreement and Mr. Datwyler replied they agreed, but are not as adamant. Further discussion followed on the escalating citations, booting and signage. Mr. Datwyler explained another proposal he would like to bring up at the work session is use of the Parking Fund revenue for other improvements downtown. The committee could weigh in on what improvements at what cost.

Member Kesgard asked about installing speed bumps in the parking garage. Further discussion followed about security, vandalism, parking violations, completion of the Lava Court affordable housing project and the Oxford Hotel helping with security issues, paying for downtown maintenance from parking fund, capping the amount spent from the parking fund, public works budget being used for snow removal and road repair and the EID. Consensus of the committee was supportive, in theory, of the funding from downtown parking for maintenance downtown being proposed to Council.

5. Discuss Urban Renewal Area Plan and Urban Renewal Area

Mr. Russell explained that he has been directed by the City Manager not to proceed with the URA; it is on hold until the new Council comes on board. The budget and staff levels are not adequate to implement at this time. The proposal from the consultant, for the plan and overview of design standards, was about \$100,000 and another \$20-30,000 for mapping and mailing. Staff, as requested, did some work on potential boundaries. Mr. Datwyler asked for input on the three alternative boundary options. He explained the three alternatives in conjunction with the study area.

The committee briefly discussed the logic of spending time on establishing boundaries when the URA may be on hold as well as a discussion of potential grant funding and urging Council to set aside money over time for this project or prioritizing as funds come in.

Mr. Vora asked about the previous conversation regarding 4th Street as a boundary for the study area and Mr. Datwyler thought the decision was to extend it to the front of 4th Street. Mr. Russell added that one advantage to going to the far side of 4th or Studio Road is picking up another right of way. Member Vidas asked if the URA is linked to zoning and Mr. Russell replied with design guidelines zoning is reviewed.

Member Vidas thought it made sense to include Studio Road. Member Kesgard asked if staff knew how much revenue would be generated from that area and Mr. Russell did not think it would be a lot. Member Kesgard also provided map information showing

zoning and areas adjacent to the study area that may be considered for inclusion in the URA.

Member Vidas asked if there was a specific size for the URA that would be good and Mr. Datwyler explained there is a limit to the size. Mr. Russell added there is a limit of 15% of the assessed value of city that can be in urban renewal areas and the city already has two. Member Kesgard asked how far north the Murphy URA goes and if it would be logical to start the boundary there. Mr. Russell replied Murphy URA goes to Powers Road and that is something the committee could talk about. Further discussion followed on the southern boundary, asking legal counsel about removing land east of the Parkway from the Downtown URA, since it was not improved, and adding it to the CAP renewal area, and the possible northern and eastern boundary locations. Mr. Russell explained that once a plan is in place it can be increased by up to 20%. Member Kesgard suggested that committee members drive through the various areas discussed and then discuss them at the next meeting to some conclusion. Vice Chair Eager reiterated the committee's plan of action is to get a revised boundary map based on discussions, adopt it as the preferred boundary map and send it to Council as their recommendation; then field research can be started.

Member Kesgard will modify the map to reflect the committee discussions and staff will send it to the committee.

6. Future Work Plan/Committee Terms

Member Kesgard commented that both Member Holt and Chair Lewis are interested in continuing to serve on the committee. Staff will take care of getting paperwork to them.

A brief discussion was held on meeting times and frequency and consensus was to have the meetings at 7:00 a.m. on the fourth Tuesday of the month and continue them monthly.

Further talk ensued about the map and focus area. Staff will have a map out next week for the committee's review.

Member Kesgard confirmed the next meeting will be October 28th at 7:00 a.m. in this room.

7. Comments for Discussion from Committee Members

There were none.

8. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 6:33 p.m.