

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
SPRINGFIELD ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AGENCY
HELD MONDAY, MARCH 10, 2008

The Springfield Economic Development Agency met in the Library Meeting Room, 225 Fifth Street, Springfield, Oregon on Monday, March 10, 2008 at 7:16 p.m., with Board Chair John Woodrow presiding.

ATTENDANCE

Present were Board Chair John Woodrow and Board Members Anne Ballew, Faye Stewart, Sid Leiken, Christine Lundberg, Joe Pishioneri, and Dave Ralston. Also present were City Manager Gino Grimaldi, Assistant City Manager Jeff Towery, Attorney Bill Van Vactor, Community Development Manager John Tamulonis and City Recorder Amy Sowa.

Board Members Bill Dwyer and Hillary Wylie were absent (excused).

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- a. Minutes of February 25, 2008.

IT WAS MOVED BY BOARD MEMBER LUNDBERG WITH A SECOND BY BOARD MEMBER LEIKEN TO APPROVE THE FEBRUARY 25, 2008 MINUTES. THE MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 7 FOR AND 0 AGAINST (2 Absent – Dwyer and Wylie).

COMMUNICATIONS

- a. Business from the Audience

None.

- b. Correspondence

Mr. Tamulonis said correspondence was received from Annette Spickard, Lane County Assessor, modifying the base value of the urban renewal district as noted in the letter submitted last week. It was reduced by \$1M. A parcel had been included in last week's value that should not have been included.

Board Member Ballew asked a question about the tax base. Mr. Tamulonis responded.

IT WAS MOVED BY BOARD MEMBER STEWART WITH A SECOND BY BOARD MEMBER PISHIONERI TO ACCEPT THE CORRESPONDENCE FOR FILING. THE MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 7 FOR AND 0 AGAINST (2 Absent – Dwyer and Wylie).

- c. Business from the Staff.

None.

REPORT OF CHAIR

None.

REPORT OF COMMITTEES

None.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

None.

OLD BUSINESS

- a. Appoint Candidates for Remaining Positions on the Downtown Urban Renewal Advisory Committee.

Community Development Manager John Tamulonis presented the staff report on this item. Composition of the Downtown Urban Renewal Advisory Committee was approved by SEDA on November 26, 2007. There are eleven positions proposed on the Advisory Committee for applicants connected or involved with Downtown area and two positions remain to be appointed.

The City Council and SEDA might consider adding additional members to the Advisory Committee. This Advisory Committee to SEDA might play an expanded role by serving as a City advisory committee to help implement the downtown redevelopment strategy and assuming responsibilities that could emerge during development and public review of the strategies. Initially, however, the SEDA Advisory Committee will need to familiarize itself with the general mechanics of urban renewal and the specifics of the Downtown Springfield Urban Renewal Plan and opportunities for projects, programs, and redevelopment actions over the next several budget years.

Mr. Tamulonis said at the February 25 SEDA meeting, the Board looked at potential applicants for the downtown advisory committee. During that meeting, the Board filled the first nine positions. Those appointed members were listed on Attachment 2 included in the agenda packet. Two positions were still open. The Board had chosen five applicants during the February 25 meeting to interview and had added another applicant to be interviewed. He noted a list of questions that could be used by the Board for the interviews. He said the typical process was to bring in one applicant at a time. He distributed the questions to the Board and staff members.

Discussion was held regarding how much the membership would be expanded and how that could be determined.

Board Chair Woodrow asked for a motion to expand the committee to fifteen members.

IT WAS MOVED BY BOARD MEMBER LUNDBERG WITH A SECOND BY BOARD MEMBER PISHIONERI TO EXPAND THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO 15 MEMBERS.

Board Member Ralston said he would approve adding four more positions rather than six.

Board Member Lundberg said the people to be interviewed had already received three or more votes from the group on February 25 for appointment to the committee. They would be building off the group that many had already singled out for appointment.

Board Chair Woodrow restated the motion.

THE MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 5 FOR, 2 AGAINST (Ralston and Ballew), AND 2 ABSENT (Dwyer and Wylie).

Board Chair Woodrow said the Board needed to determine terms for each position. He also noted that it might be best to just ask two or three questions of each candidate.

Mr. Tamulonis suggested appointing two candidates to a one year term, two candidates to a two-year term, and two candidates to a three-year term.

Board Member Ralston said if the Board was going to appoint all six, the responses to the questions could determine the length of term.

Discussion was held regarding the three questions to be asked.

Board Member Ralston said he would ask question 5 and 6 combined:

- What is an issue you see in the Downtown and what do you see in the Downtown's future?

Board Member Pishioneri said he would ask question number 3:

- What special skills do you have to share with the Urban Renewal Advisory Committee?

Board Member Stewart said he would ask question number 8:

- Can you commit the time necessary to be an effective Advisory Committee member?
This means as much as two evening meetings monthly.

The candidates were brought in individually to be interviewed.

Board Chair asked each board member to introduce themselves to the candidates.

The following candidates were interviewed.

- Tess Chedsey
- Karen Hageman
- Steve Moe
- John Thomas
- James Yarnall
- Shannon Mudge

Following each candidate's interview, they were asked if they had questions of the Board.

Ms. Chedsey asked if this was a new committee or if it had been in place for a number of years.

Mr. Tamulonis explained the urban renewal agency and why it was formed.

Mr. Haberman said she wished she had started getting on committees earlier and she felt it was time to get involved and give back. She was glad to be at the beginning of the process. She said she loved Springfield. She had no questions of the Board. She thanked the Board for the opportunity to be interviewed.

Mr. Moe said he did not have questions for the Board.

Mr. Thomas said having the urban renewal district available was a great opportunity and he felt Springfield understood what they were looking for. This would be the catalyst to make downtown grow.

Sid Leiken disclosed that he was a client of Mr. Thomas.

Mr. Yarnall said he had been in this area for years and had seen the downtown through many ups and downs. Now was a golden opportunity to get the downtown ready to meet the long-term needs of the community. He discussed the A, B, C strategy: A was affordability; B was beauty; C was compatibility; and D was disability (addressing the needs for the disabled important). Everything needed to come together in a coordinated way. He thanked the Board for the opportunity to serve.

Mr. Mudge said he wanted to know the committee's focus.

Mr. Tamulonis said the urban renewal agency was in its infancy right now and would be going on for about twenty years. They would first focus on the vision for downtown, then how to make investments over a period of time. The urban renewal agency would be focusing on infrastructure and programs to assist businesses in the downtown. The advisory committee could identify what the City could do overall, as well as SEDA.

Board Member Ballew said the City was doing Citywide sanitary sewer and stormwater studies.

Board Member Stewart said infrastructure had been the main focus in the Glenwood urban renewal area over the past few years. SEDA would be looking to make sure the correct moves were made in that area.

Mr. Mudge said being a business owner, he had noticed that there was not much space for retail in downtown. He asked how they could motivate different decision making rather than just leaving open spaces.

Board Member Woodrow said a great deal would follow what the committee did in conjunction with downtown, the vision the committee formed for the downtown and how that was communicated to the rest of the downtown business and property owners. Much of that could come about as they started to see change.

Board Member Leiken said Mr. Mudge posed a great question. SEDA was clearly looking for people for the advisory committee that could bring different talents and look at those opportunities. Getting more retail was something we needed to strive for.

Board Chair Woodrow told each candidate that the Board would be making a decision tonight and staff would notify the candidates.

Board Member Ralston said he had concerns about two of the candidates. If the Board was still planning on appointing all six, he would suggest that two had terms of one year, two had terms of two years and two had terms of three years. He would prefer, however, to only appoint four.

Board Member Pishioneri suggested appointing the candidates with the following terms: Tess Chedsey - 1 year; Karen Hageman – 2 years; Steve Moe – 2 year; John Thomas – 3 years; James Yarnell – 1 year; and Shannon Mudge – 3 years. He liked seeing some new people for the longer terms.

Board Member Ralston said he agreed with everything, except he would prefer Karen Hageman serve for 3 years and Shannon Mudge serve for 2 year.

Board Member Stewart said he was fine with whatever terms were assigned. He appreciated having the interviews and thought all of the candidates would bring something to the committee. There was diversity among all candidates. With proper leadership and a strong chair, those that Board Member Ralston was concerned about could do well. He said the terms were all fine.

Board Member Leiken said he also agreed with Board Member Pishioneri's suggestion. All six were great candidates and he was very impressed. It was great to see both veteran committee members and new people.

Board Member Lundberg agreed with Board Member Pishioneri's recommendation. She reminded the board that the rest of the committee which was appointed on February 25 was a very strong group. This committee could be a powerful force to move the downtown urban renewal area in the right direction. She wanted to make sure all the other candidates that wouldn't be appointed to this committee could remain involved in some way with the downtown.

Board Chair Woodrow asked Board Member Ralston if he could support the recommendation as suggested by Board Member Pishioneri.

Board Member Ralston said he preferred the change in terms, but could support the recommendation.

IT WAS MOVED BY BOARD MEMBER PISHIONERI WITH A SECOND BY BOARD MEMBER STEWART TO APPOINT TESS CHEDSEY FOR A ONE YEAR TERM, KAREN HAGEMAN FOR A TWO YEAR TERM, STEVE MOE FOR A TWO YEAR TERM, JOHN THOMAS FOR A THREE YEAR TERM, JAMES YARNALL FOR A ONE YEAR TERM, AND SHANNON MUDGE FOR A THREE YEAR TERM. THE MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 7 FOR AND 0 AGAINST (2 ABSENT – Dwyer and Wylie).

Board Member Ballew said this was an amazing group and it was SEDA's charge to make sure their time was well spent.

City Attorney Bill Van Vactor called in the applicants.

Mr. Tamulonis said the Mayor and Council could determine if this group's task was changed to encompass a different charge. There were other people interested and the Mayor and Council could decide to create a separate group with a different focus for those people.

All of the candidates entered the meeting.

Board Chair Woodrow thanked the candidates for applying. He said the Board was very impressed with the quality of applicants and decided to expand the committee to include all of the six candidates interviewed tonight. Letters would be sent out to each candidate notifying them of the terms of their office.

b. Review of Project P20516: East 14th Avenue Multi-Use Path.

Civil Engineer Jeff Paschall presented the staff report on this item. Staff would like to review the first capital project in Glenwood funded by the Springfield Economic Development Agency. This project was requested by Glenwood residents, and accomplished through cooperation between the Lane Transit District (LTD) and the City. Also, the Glenwood Renewal Advisory Committee has agreed to provide and install landscaping along the path.

This project included the construction of approximately 400' of an asphalt path from the westerly end of East 14th Avenue to Glenwood Boulevard. The project also included the installation of street lights from Henderson Avenue to Glenwood Boulevard.

The amount of the construction contract awarded to Wildish Construction Co. was \$95,140.00, with the cost of the final project totaling \$90,767.56. The cost of City staff time for development, design and construction inspection is approximately \$30,616.40, with only work on the as-builts remaining.

All work done under this contract has been completed and inspected by the City Engineer and found to be satisfactory. Staff requests that the Springfield Economic Development Agency review the project prior to a resolution being sent to the Council for acceptance.

Mr. Paschall said the project was completed under budget. He referred to a poster board that showed the finished path. He said he had seen people using the path whenever he had been out there to check out the path.

Mr. Paschall said this project would be coming to the City Council for final approval next month.

NEW BUSINESS

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:27 pm.

Minutes Recorder – Amy Sowa

Christine Lundberg
Secretary