



## AGENDA

### VENETA URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY

**MONDAY, JUNE 8, 2015, immediately following the City Council meeting**

Veneta Administrative Center - 88184 Eighth Street - Veneta, OR

---

1. **CALL TO ORDER**
2. **PUBLIC COMMENT** - Maximum time 20 minutes. Speakers will be limited to 3 minutes each. The Agency will not engage in any discussion or make any decisions based on public comment at this time; however, they may take comments under advisement for discussion and action at a future Agency meeting.
3. **APPROVED BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015-16**
  - a. Public Hearing on Approved Budget
    - 1) Open Hearing
    - 2) Staff Report (pgs. 3-6)
    - 3) Public Comment
    - 4) Questions from Committee
    - 5) Close Hearing
    - 6) Committee Deliberation (if needed)
  - b. **ADOPTION OF BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015-16**
    - i. Agenda Item Summary (pg. 7)
    - ii. **RESOLUTION No. 99** – A RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE OPERATING BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015-2016; SPECIFYING APPROPRIATIONS; AND IMPOSING TAXES (pgs. 9-10)
4. **CONSENT AGENDA**
  - a. Minutes for April 13, 2015 Work Session (pgs. 11-13)
  - b. Minutes for May 11, 2015 (pgs. 15-16)
5. **LOAN AUTHORIZATION**
  - i. **RESOLUTION No. 100** – A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE BORROWING OF MONEY AND PLEDGING OF TAX INCREMENT REVENUES (pgs. 17-18)
6. **BALANCE FY 2014-15 BUDGET**
  - i. **RESOLUTION No. 101** – A RESOLUTION BALANCING BUDGETED INTERFUND [INTERAGENCY] TRANSFERS FOR THE 2014-15 FISCAL YEAR BUDGET (pg. 19)
7. **ADOPTION OF THE URBAN RENEWAL PLAN AMENDMENTS**
  - i. Agenda Item Summary (pg. 21)
  - ii. **RESOLUTION No. 102** - A RESOLUTION PROPOSING A MINOR AMENDMENT TO THE VENETA URBAN RENEWAL PLAN ("PLAN") (pgs. 23-138)
8. **OTHER**
9. **ADJOURN**

**PUBLIC HEARINGS** - Please observe the following rules.

**WRITTEN TESTIMONY:**

Written comments received seven (7) days prior to the meeting have been incorporated in the staff report. All comments, including those received up until the meeting, are presented to the Urban Renewal Agency members to be considered in their decision.

**ORAL TESTIMONY:**

If you wish to testify with regard to a matter which has been set for **Public Hearing** please observe the following rules:

1. **State your name and address.**
2. **Limit your testimony to three (3) minutes. Testimony must be specific to the issue at hand. Keep your comments brief and to the point. Comments can be in favor, against, or neutral regarding the proposal.**

The Urban Renewal Agency considers all public comments, staff reports, and City ordinances in arriving at a final decision. **Staff reports are available for review at Veneta City Hall - 88184 8th Street - Veneta, Oregon.**

# VENETA URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

---

Title/Topic: Public Hearing on Approved Budget

---

Meeting Date: June 8, 2015

Department: Finance

Staff Contact: Shauna Hartz

Email: shartz@ci.veneta.or.us

Telephone Number: 541-935-2191 Ext. 305

---

### ISSUE STATEMENT

To continue Agency operations beyond June 30, 2015 the Agency Board needs to adopt the Fiscal Year 2015-16 Budget. Prior to considering the budget, the Agency Board is required, by State Budget Law, to conduct a hearing on the budget as it was approved by the budget committee.

### BACKGROUND

The State of Oregon has established a process by which governmental and other agencies create and adopt an operating budget for a specified amount of time. The timeline for the process is up to the individual agencies; however, the budget does need to be adopted by midnight on June 30<sup>th</sup> for operations to continue legally.

One of the State's objectives for the process is to allow for citizen involvement and participation. This is achieved by appointing citizen members to be on the budget committee, public notices being published, and by conducting public hearings.

The public hearing scheduled for tonight, on the Fiscal Year 2015-16 Approved Budget, was noticed in the newspaper on May 27, 2015. A copy of the notice is attached. The approval was granted, by the budget committee, on May 14, 2015.

Attached also is a summary, by fund, of the projected beginning fund balance, anticipated new revenues, expected expenditures, the projected ending fund balance, and the total budget. Detail sheets can be provided upon request. The entire Approved Budget is available for review at the City's Administrative Center (City Hall).

Attachment C is the draft minutes from the meeting at which the budget committee approved the budget and levied property taxes.

### AGENCY OPTIONS

The role of the Agency Board during this hearing is to listen to and discuss public comments regarding the Fiscal Year 2015-16 Approved Budget. If the Agency Board, based on the public comment, wishes to make changes to the approved budget, they can do so, with some limitations, prior to adopting the budget.

### ATTACHMENTS

- A. Copy of Public Hearing Notice
- B. Summary of Approved Budget
- C. Draft Minutes of the Budget Committee's May 14, 2015 Meeting

## FORM UR-1

## NOTICE OF BUDGET HEARING

A public meeting of the Veneta Urban Renewal Agency will be held on June 8, 2015 after the Veneta City Council Meeting at 88184 8th Street, Veneta, Oregon. The purpose of this meeting is to discuss the budget for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2015 as approved by the Agency Budget Committee. A summary of the budget is presented below. A copy of the budget may be inspected or obtained at 88184 8th Street, between the hours of 9:00 a.m. and 4:30 p.m. or online at [www.venetaoregon.gov](http://www.venetaoregon.gov). This budget is for an annual budget period. This budget was prepared on a basis of accounting that is the same as the preceding year.

Contact: Shauna Hartz

Telephone: 541-935-2191

Email: [shartz@ci.veneta.or.us](mailto:shartz@ci.veneta.or.us)

## FINANCIAL SUMMARY - RESOURCES

TOTAL OF ALL FUNDS	Actual Amount	Adopted Budget	Approved Budget
	2013-2014	This Year 2014-2015	Next Year 2015-2016
Beginning Fund Balance/Net Working Capital	980,445	1,233,945	1,235,537
Federal, State and All Other Grants			
Revenue from Bonds and Other Debt		300,000	300,000
Interfund Transfers			
All Other Resources Except Division of Tax & Special Levy	2,119	600	1,600
Revenue from Division of Tax	656,153	611,700	657,055
Revenue from Special Levy			
<b>Total Resources</b>	<b>1,638,717</b>	<b>2,146,245</b>	<b>2,194,192</b>

## FINANCIAL SUMMARY - REQUIREMENTS BY OBJECT CLASSIFICATION

Personnel Services			
Materials and Services	18,935	68,325	65,500
Capital Outlay			
Debt Service	278,025	580,550	578,238
Interfund Transfers			
Contingencies		5,000	5,000
All Other Expenditures and Requirements	10,360	305,000	195,000
Unappropriated Ending Fund Balance	1,331,397	1,187,370	1,350,454
<b>Total Requirements</b>	<b>1,638,717</b>	<b>2,146,245</b>	<b>2,194,192</b>

## FINANCIAL SUMMARY-REQUIREMENTS AND FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT EMPLOYEES (FTE) BY ORGANIZATIONAL UNIT OR PROGRAM \*

Name of Organizational Unit or Program			
FTE for that unit or program			
Non-Departmental / Non-Program	307,320	958,875	843,738
FTE			
<b>Total Requirements</b>	<b>307,320</b>	<b>958,875</b>	<b>843,738</b>
<b>Total FTE</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

## STATEMENT OF CHANGES IN ACTIVITIES and SOURCES OF FINANCING \*

The requirements and resources are virtually unchanged from the current year's budget to the approved budget for fiscal year 2015-16. Two slight differences are that we expect slightly more revenue from taxes, the adopted fiscal year 2014-15 amount was understated, and slightly less "Other Requirements". The current year budget included a \$90,000 transfers not needed in the upcoming year.

## STATEMENT OF INDEBTEDNESS

LONG TERM DEBT	Estimated Debt Outstanding July 1	Estimated Debt Authorized, But Not Incurred on July 1
General Obligation Bonds	\$0	\$0
Other Bonds	\$1,390,000	\$0
Other Borrowings	\$0	\$300,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$1,390,000</b>	<b>\$300,000</b>

**SUMMARY OF RESOURCES AND REQUIREMENTS**

FUND	BEGINNING FUND BALANCE		TOTAL RESOURCES	TOTAL EXPENDITURES	ENDING FUND BALANCE	
	PROJECTED FUND BALANCE @ 7-1-2015	TOTAL REVENUE			PROJECTED FUND BALANCE @ 6-30-2016	TOTAL REQUIREMENTS
GENERAL	217,192	300,750	517,942	265,500	252,442	517,942
DEBT SERVICE	1,018,344	657,905	1,676,249	578,238	1,098,012	1,676,249
TOTALS	\$1,235,536	\$958,655	\$2,194,191	\$843,738	\$1,350,454	\$2,194,191

**Urban Renewal Agency Budget Committee Minutes  
May 14, 2015**

**Committee Members Present:** Calvin Kenney, Thomas Cotter, Sandra Larson, Robbie McCoy, Tim Brooker, Thomas Laing, George Hageman, Victoria Hedenstrom, James Skinner, and Keith Weiss  
**Staff Members Present:** Ric Ingham, City Administrator and Shauna Hartz, Finance Director

**CALL TO ORDER**

Tom Cotter called the Urban Renewal Agency Budget Committee to order at 8:11 p.m.

**ADMINISTRATIVE TASKS**

The committee consensus was to have the same Chairperson and Secretary as the City's budget committee.

Ric Ingham read the Agency's budget message.

**REVIEW OF PROPOSED BUDGET**

Hartz reviewed the budget document. She said the Urban Renewal Agency Budget has two funds; a general fund and a debt service fund. She said neither of these funds have any departments within them. She said the overview format is the same as was provided for the City. She said the total budget for this upcoming year is \$2,194,191. Hartz said on page 69 there was a mistake in the contingency total for this proposed budget year. She said that amount should have stayed at the \$5000 level instead of \$15,000 which changes both the total expenditures and the ending fund balance by \$10,000. She didn't change it because this is a proposed budget, but the final budget will be corrected.

In response to a question from Hedenstrom, Hartz said "DuJour" means to borrow money from a bank for only a few days or a week.

In response to a question from Larson, Hartz said there is a requirement that we can only use property tax money for debt service.

In response to a question from Kenney, Ingham explained what excess value is based on.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

There were no members of the public present at the meeting.

**APPROVAL**

**MOTION:** Calvin Kenney made a motion that the budget committee of the Urban Renewal Agency approves the budget for the fiscal year 2015-16 in the amount of \$2,194,191. James Skinner seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

**MOTION:** Tom Laing made a motion that the budget committee of the Urban Renewal Agency approves property taxes for fiscal year 2015-16 in the amount of \$691,994. James Skinner seconded the motion. The motion was then passed unanimously.

**ADJOURN**

Chairperson Cotter adjourned the Budget Committee meeting at 8:30 p.m.  
p.m.

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Tom Cotter, Chairperson

Attest: XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Calvin Kenney, Secretary

# VENETA URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

---

Title/Topic: Adoption of Budget for Fiscal Year 2015-16

---

Meeting Date: June 8, 2015  
Department: Finance

Staff Contact: Shauna Hartz  
Email: shartz@ci.veneta.or.us  
Telephone Number: 541-935-2191 Ext. 305

---

### ISSUE STATEMENT

To operate legally past June 30, 2015, the Agency is required to adopt a budget for fiscal year 2015-16.

### BACKGROUND

The Proposed Budget for fiscal year 2015-16 was presented to the Budget Committee on May 14, 2015. On that same date the Budget Committee approved the proposed budget without making any changes. The committee also imposed a tax levy and specified appropriations. The next required step is for the Agency Board to conduct a hearing on the approved budget. The notice for the hearing was published in the newspaper on May 27, 2015 and the hearing was conducted at the Agency's June 8, 2015 meeting. The resolution included in this packet contains the necessary parts for official action.

### COUNCIL OPTIONS

1. Approve resolution without changes
2. Approve resolution after requesting changes
3. Deny resolution and provide direction to staff

### CITY ADMINISTRATOR'S RECOMMENDATION

Approve resolution as presented.

### SUGGESTED MOTION

"I make a motion to approve Resolution No. 99 a resolution adopting the operating budget for fiscal year 2015-2016; specifying appropriations; and imposing taxes, as presented."



**VENETA URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY  
LANE COUNTY, OREGON**

**RESOLUTION NO. 99**

**A RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE OPERATING BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015-2016;  
SPECIFYING APPROPRIATIONS; AND IMPOSING TAXES**

**PART I - ADOPTION:**

BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of the Veneta Urban Renewal Agency hereby adopts the budget, approved by the Veneta Urban Renewal Agency Budget Committee on May 14, 2015 for the 2015-2016 fiscal year in the total amount of \$2,194,192, \$1,350,454 of which is unappropriated, now on file at Veneta Administrative Center; and

**PART II - APPROPRIATIONS:**

BE IT RESOLVED that the amounts for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2015 and for the purposes shown on Exhibit "A" a total of \$843,738 be appropriated; and

**PART III – TAX LEVY BY FUND:**

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board of the Veneta Urban Renewal Agency hereby resolves to certify to the county assessor for the Veneta Urban Renewal Plan Area a request for \$691,994 or the maximum amount of revenue that may be raised by dividing the taxes under section 1c, Article IX, of the Oregon Constitution, and \$0.00 as the amount to be raised through the imposition of a special levy; and

BE IT ALSO FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board of the Veneta Urban Renewal Agency directs the Finance Director/Budget Officer to certify to the County Assessor of Lane County, Oregon, the tax levy made by this resolution and shall file required documents by July 15, 2015.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Veneta Urban Renewal Agency has approved this resolution to be declared adopted on this \_\_\_\_\_ day of June, 2015.

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX  
Sandra H. Larson, Chair

Attest:

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX  
Darci Henneman, City Recorder

EXHIBIT A RESOLUTION NO. 99					
FUND	MATERIALS & SERVICES	DEBT SERVICE	TRANSFERS	CONTINGENCY	TOTAL TO BE APPROPRIATED
GENERAL	65,500	0	195,000	5,000	265,500
DEBT SERVICE	0	578,238	0	0	578,238
TOTALS	\$65,500	\$578,238	\$195,000	\$5,000	\$843,738

# Minutes of the Veneta Urban Renewal Agency Work Session

## April 13, 2015

Present: Sandra Larson, Tim Brooker, Thomas Cotter, Victoria Hedenstrom, and Thomas Laing

Staff: Ric Ingham, City Administrator; Kay Bork, Community Development Director; Lisa Garbett, Associate Planner; Darci Henneman, Assistant City Recorder, and Joan Mariner, Fern Ridge Review

---

### 1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Larson called the Urban Renewal Agency meeting to order at 6:06 p.m.

### 2. URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY OVERVIEW

Garbett provided an overview of the projects for the Urban Renewal District and reviewed the adopted project's list, which staff clarified, provided an amendment, and prioritized. She said the owner of three lots on W. Broadway would like to build a St. Vincent/DePaul retail store and staff looked at a couple of options that will be provided later in the meeting. She reviewed the timeline of the Urban Renewal Agency (URA).

In response to a question from Thomas Cotter, Ingham said we don't have to spend these funds by a certain time.

In response to a question from Chair Larson, Ingham said the water pipeline project was completed in 2013 but we'll be paying for the debt service for several years.

### 3. PROPOSED PROJECT PRIORITIZATION

Garbett reviewed the power point presentation and the 2015 project list and asked if Agency members had any questions.

In response to a question from Chair Larson, Ingham said completing street improvements is all about priorities. He said in the last 31 years the Agency has accomplished a lot but the bulk of URA funds have gone to water projects and downtown improvements. He suggested we start at the top of the list and work our way down but we should think about setting aside funds for pool additions, etc. He said the next catalyst project on W. Broadway would be line item 14 - Downtown Improvements. He said we don't want to put a dollar amount on each item but we should determine if we're on the right track and whether or not we should hold funds for a big project down the road.

In response to a question from Thomas Cotter, Ingham said he felt we received enough grant funds to complete the fiber optic project. If the Council wanted to build out another phase, we can discuss that. He said going back to the 1984 Plan, we have generally followed the intent and projects identified but he's not sure where fiber optics would fit in.

Thomas Cotter said since the line goes along Jeans Rd. he thought bringing fiber optics to that area would draw businesses in and give us an advantage, even if it's just reflecting grant money.

Bork said we could make sure it complies with the intent of the Plan if it wasn't a project called out. She said there's some language in the 2007 adopted Plan which incorporated downtown concepts so maybe there's some similar language that addresses that.

In response to a question from Chair Larson, Garbett said the projects are not in priority but are in the order of the original list.

Garbett reviewed the completed project list and the proposed project prioritization.

In response to a question from Chair Larson, Ingham said staff is working on securing grants through the current work plan, but we made a commitment to West Lane Fitness to do the east sidewalk improvements on 5<sup>th</sup> St. He said we talked about improvements on 2<sup>nd</sup> St., do the build out from Territorial, and follow the Work Plan.

In response to a question from Tim Brooker, Ingham said debt service is already calculated into the amount spent towards the maximum indebtedness.

Garbett said the amount listed on the 2015 Projects List includes some new project estimates but also includes actual cost when completed and includes the debt service.

In response to a question from Victoria Hedenstrom, Bork said the current right of way only extends Brooker Ln. from 4<sup>th</sup> to 7<sup>th</sup> St. Bork said it was in the Downtown Master Plan as eventually going through but she doesn't know if its still a high priority to the Agency.

Ingham said if Brooker Ln. extends to 8<sup>th</sup> St. it would be so close to the bridge, it would be non-functioning. He said it would be a very expensive phase and we'd have to evaluate if it will open up new commercial property for development or could it just be developed from Broadway

In response to a question from Thomas Laing, Garbett said the 2015 proposed project list included administrative costs. The actual cost was over \$100,000 and staff included a number of estimated costs for some of the projects.

Ingham said administrative charges consist of what's been accrued to this point; legal expenses, auditing costs and we are reimbursing the City for staff time. He said direct project costs are captured within the line item of the project. He said a R.A.R.E. Intern would be considered administrative costs.

Ingham said the Downtown Master Plan included streetscape from Highway 126 south, to match with Brooker Ln. and W. Broadway, and should be included in the project list.

In response to a question from Thomas Cotter, Garbett said the four corners beautification project strip is from ODOT's right of way up to the existing sidewalks.

In response to a question from Thomas Laing, Ingham said ODOT's right of way is different for each corner at the four corner intersection.

After a brief discussion, it was the consensus that the Agency is on the right track.

Tim Brooker said the overall idea to beautify the City and create a downtown area is a good one.

#### **4. ST. VINCENT/DEPAUL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL**

Ingham said St. Vincent/DePaul hasn't recently said they want to build a store somewhere in Veneta but several years ago, when they purchased the three lots on W. Broadway, it was always their intent to do so. Ingham said to help move the discussion along, Mr. McDonald asked the City to provide him with some options. He said Mr. McDonald understands our vision and he wants to support that. Based on that, staff is asking for feedback from the Agency if we want the store on those three lots or should we provide some options for them.

Garbett said all of these sites are within the Urban Renewal boundary. She said we want to be proactive and know what the City Council's goals and wishes are with regard to the Urban Renewal District. She reviewed the preliminary layout of the options.

In response to a question from Thomas Cotter, Ingham said we have four more years to pay the Larson judgment.

In response to a question from Victoria Hedenstrom, Ingham said the Front Row Video site on McCutcheon is too small.

Tim Brooker said St. Vincent's best option would be to build on the corner of 8<sup>th</sup> St. and Jack Kelley Dr.

Ingham said if Mr. McDonald built a boutique like retail building between 4<sup>th</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> St., fronting 3<sup>rd</sup> St., it would possibly attract another business to the downtown area which we want to see. He said we don't want the traditional big iconic retail store.

**5. OTHER**  
None

**6. ADJOURN**

Chair Larson adjourned the Veneta Urban Renewal Agency work session at 7:00 p.m.

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

---

Sandra Larson, Chair

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

---

Darci Henneman, Assistant City Recorder



# Minutes of the Veneta Urban Renewal Agency

## May 11, 2015

Present: Sandra Larson, Tim Brooker, Thomas Cotter, Victoria Hedenstrom, and Thomas Laing

Staff: Ric Ingham, City Administrator; Kay Bork, Community Development Director; Shauna Hartz, Finance Director; Kyle Schauer, Public Works Director; Darci Henneman, City Recorder, and Joan Mariner, Fern Ridge Review

---

### 1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Larson called the Urban Renewal Agency to order at 8:33 p.m.

### 2. PUBLIC COMMENT

None

### 3. CONSENT AGENDA

**MOTION:** Thomas Cotter made a motion to approve the Consent Agenda as presented. Thomas Laing seconded the motion.

**VOTE:** Thomas Laing, aye; Thomas Cotter, aye; Sandra Larson, aye; Victoria Hedenstrom, aye; Tim Brooker, aye.

### 4. PROPOSED 2015 AMENDMENT TO PROJECT PRIORITIZATION LIST – TABLE 8

Ingham reviewed the timeline and prioritization list and asked if there were any questions. He said the end result of Table 8 shows that the Urban Renewal Agency's estimated unobligated maximum indebtedness is 5.4 million dollars and that includes over one million dollars of estimated project costs yet to be completed. He said we've only spent about 55% of the maximum indebtedness allowed.

Hartz said she would double check to make sure the amount is what we actually spent or if it includes the 10 year commitment for the water pipeline loan.

Ingham said if this looks okay, staff will incorporate Table 8 into the Plan and bring it back for future adoption.

In response to a question from Chair Larson, Hartz said no. 7 was included with no. 6.

Ingham said the 2002 water expansion project was completed and it was all rolled into that debt service but it didn't have its own Urban Renewal funds to define it.

It was the consensus of the agency to direct staff to bring the Plan back to the Agency for final adoption.

### 5. FEEDBACK FROM ST. VINCENT/DEPAUL ON PREFERRED DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVES

Ingham said based on direction from the Agency, staff provided the options to Mr. McDonald. He said he and Mr. McDonald had a good discussion but Mr. McDonald felt that none of the downtown sites were conducive to the kind of store St. Vincent/DePaul wanted to build and he indicated they would like to look at tax lot 600. Ingham said St. Vincent would have to use tax market credits to fund construction of a store but the next round of dispersing those credits is a year out, so he wouldn't be submitting an application or be active in designing or consulting for another 16 to 18 months, which gives us time to work through this. He said St. Vincent will be concerned with the flood plain and the wetlands on the site.

In response to questions from Victoria Hedenstrom, Ingham said the City mitigated on site wetlands for other wetlands. He explained the wetland mitigation process; wetlands on a smaller site are developed

and in return, a site adjacent to the Fern Ridge reservoir was developed into wetlands to create a continuous area that supports larger habitat and make mass wetlands. Ingham said Mr. McDonald was very committed to do something on three other tax lots but he can't get his managers on board. He said its up to the Council to decide if we want to hold onto tax lot 600 in the hopes of a hotel coming or if we sell it to St. Vincent, it would be at their discretion what or how its developed.

In response to a question from Chair Larson, Ingham said Mr. McDonald stressed that the current three lots on Broadway aren't viable and tax lot 600 is because it's a large, visible lot.

In response to a question from Victoria Hedenstrom, Ingham said the same folks that own the pawn shop on the southeast corner of Territorial and Jeans Rd. owns the property to the east next to BiMart. He said they are not interested in selling the property. He said we could have Bork and Warrick look at that building as some kind of nuisance.

Chair Larson said if we were to proceed in selling tax lot 600 to St. Vincent we would need to think about what we want to do with W. Broadway.

Ingham said having a larger parcel on W. Broadway to work with, we would likely create some kind of a master development plan; working with a commercial enterprise to put together a RFP and also determine what level of contribution the Agency wants to put toward a major project. He said we think we've climbed out of the recession and Veneta is going to continue to grow.

Ingham said the owners have submitted some expenses for façade improvements of which the Agency committed covering up to \$10,000. He said staff would like to get those costs obligated in the 2014-15 budget so we're working on agreements and appropriate reimbursements.

In response to questions from Chair Larson, Ingham said Dustrud Architects has proposed a design which the WLF folks will modify. He said WLF was trying to have the façade of their building echo the Service Center but it's a financial issue. He said the new garage door changed the façade and we're considering making that the agreed façade improvement from the Urban Renewal Agency. He said getting the parking lot paved and all the other improvements made a huge difference. Ingham said the "West Lane Fitness" sign wasn't done correctly so it will be replaced.

**6. OTHER**

None

**7. ADJOURN**

Chair Larson adjourned the Veneta Urban Renewal Agency at 8:46 p.m.

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

---

Sandra H. Larson, Chair

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

---

Darci Henneman, City Recorder  
(Minutes prepared by DHenneman)

**VENETA URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY  
LANE COUNTY, OREGON**

**RESOLUTION NO. 100**

**A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE BORROWING OF MONEY AND PLEDGING  
OF TAX INCREMENT REVENUES**

**WHEREAS**, the Veneta Urban Renewal Agency (“Agency”) finds it desirable to authorize the borrowing of not more than \$300,000 to be used for projects and administration of the Veneta Urban Renewal Plan, and to pledge the Tax Increment Revenues as security of such borrowing;

**WHEREAS**, the Agency desires to issue and sell the obligation to Banner Bank (Bank)

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE VENETA URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY:**

Section 1. Definitions. For purposes of this resolution, the following terms in quotation marks shall have the following meanings, unless the context clearly requires otherwise:

“Area” means the Veneta Urban Renewal Area which is described in the Plan.

“Plan” means the Veneta Urban Renewal Plan, which is dated October 23, 1984 and amended on August 14, 2006 and February 26, 2007.

“General Fund” means any separate fund or account of the Agency which is not part of the Tax Increment Fund, and which is used to hold the proceeds of the borrowing.

“Promissory Note” means the document evidencing the indebtedness authorized by this resolution, obligating the Agency to pay the amount borrowed.

“Resolution” means this resolution authorizing the borrowing.

“Tax Increment Fund” means the fund established under ORS 457.440 to hold the Tax Increment Revenues.

“Tax Increment Revenues” means all ad valorem tax revenues which are attributable to the increase in assessed value of property within the Area pursuant to Section 1c, Article IX of the Oregon Constitution and Oregon Revised Statutes, Chapter 457, and all earnings thereon while those Tax Increment Revenues are held in the Tax Increment Fund.

Section 2. Authorization of Borrowing. The Agency shall borrow an amount not to exceed \$300,000 with a maturity of not more than 5 days from Banner Bank. The Agency will pay interest, any fees and expenses necessary to secure the borrowing. All of the Agency’s Tax Increment Revenues remaining after making the required annual payments on its Bond issued in 2001, shall be available to pay the borrowed sum and such Tax Increment Revenues are not, and shall not be, subject to any prior lien, pledge or encumbrance. The borrowing will be evidenced by a Promissory Note.

Section 3. Security for Promissory Note. The Note shall not be a general obligation of the Agency or the City of Veneta. The principal of and the interest on the Note shall be payable solely from the Tax Increment Revenues, including all amounts in the Tax Increment Fund.

Section 4. Prepayment. Prepayment of the Note is allowed without any penalties.

Section 5. General Fund; Use of Proceeds. The proceeds from the Note shall be deposited in the Agency's General Fund, and shall be used only to pay for costs of carrying out the Plan.

Section 6. Execution of the Note. The Note shall be signed with the manual signature of the Chair of the Board of the Agency and the City Administrator or his or her designee.

Section 7. Delegation. The City Administrator or his or her designee is hereby authorized on behalf of the Agency to establish the interest rate and other loan terms, carry out the necessary administrative and financial tasks, and to take any other action which is desirable in order to complete the borrowing in accordance with this Resolution.

Section 8. Designation as Qualified Tax-Exempt Obligations. The Agency hereby designates the Note for purposes of paragraph (3) of Section 265(b) of the Code as a "qualified tax-exempt obligation" and covenants that the Note does not constitute a private activity bond as defined in Section 141 of the Code, and that not more than \$10,000,000 aggregate principal amount of obligations, the interest on which is for federal income tax purposes (excluding, however, private activity bonds other than qualified 501(c)(3) bonds) including the Note, have been or shall be issued by the Agency, including all subordinate entities of the Agency, if any, during the calendar year 2012.

PASSED AND ADOPTED BY THE VENETA URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY this  
\_\_\_\_ day of June 2015.

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

\_\_\_\_\_  
Sandra H. Larson, Chair

Attest:

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

\_\_\_\_\_  
Darci Henneman, City Recorder

**VENETA URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY**

**RESOLUTION NO. 101**

**A RESOLUTION BALANCING BUDGETED INTERFUND [INTERAGENCY] TRANSFERS FOR THE 2014-2015 FISCAL YEAR BUDGET**

**WHEREAS**, Oregon Revised Statutes 294.361(2) and 294.388(3) provide for transfers of revenues between funds, and

**WHEREAS**, Oregon Administrative Rule 150-504-420, the *Oregon Department of Revenue Local Budgeting Manual*, establishes that an interagency transfer to another fund is budgeted as a requirement, and that the receiving fund(s) shall budget the transfer from another fund as a resource, and

**WHEREAS**, certain interagency transfer amounts to and from other funds in the Veneta Urban Renewal Agency 2014-2015 budget were inadvertently of unequal amounts,

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** by the Veneta Urban Renewal Agency Board that:

**SECTION 1 Appropriation Correction.** In accordance with Oregon Administrative Rule 150-504-420, the unequal interagency transfers in the 2014-2015 budget be revised to be balanced, as follows:

Name of Fund	Original		Revised	
	Transfer in	Transfer Out	Transfer in	Transfer Out
General	\$ -0-	\$ 15,000	\$ -0-	\$ 12,000

**SECTION 2 Unappropriated Fund Balance Increase.** The budgeted unappropriated ending fund balance(s) for the revised fund(s) transfers out is increased by \$3,000 in order to keep that fund(s) budgeted resources and requirements in balance.

**SECTION 3 Effective Date.** This Resolution shall take effect on June 9, 2015.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Veneta Urban Renewal Board this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2015.

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

\_\_\_\_\_  
Sandra H. Larson, Chair

ATTEST:

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

\_\_\_\_\_  
Darci Henneman, City Recorder



# VENETA URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

---

### TITLE/TOPIC: Minor Amendment to Table 8 of the Urban Renewal Plan

---

Meeting Date: June 8, 2015  
Department: Community Development

Staff Contact: Lisa Garbett  
Email: lgarbett@ci.veneta.or.us  
Telephone Number: 541-935-2191 Ext.304

---

### ISSUE STATEMENT

The Urban Renewal Agency is being asked to adopt Resolution No. 102 - a Resolution proposing a minor amendment to the Veneta Urban Renewal Plan. The minor amendment includes an update to 'Table 8 – Estimated Project Costs' and incorporates all past amendments (1998, 2000, 2002, 2007 and 2013) that were previously adopted by resolution into one document.

### BACKGROUND

In 2013, amended the Urban Renewal Plan including Urban Renewal District Area with assistance from Elaine Howard Consulting in order to include boundaries of the EWEB water pipeline project located inside city limits.

This proposed minor amendment is intended to prioritize and update project cost estimates so that urban renewal projects called for in the Plan can be completed and financed. It was the intent of staff to incorporate all of the projects that were originally adopted in the table into the final version. The proposed minor amendment includes the following, as shown in Exhibit A, attached to Resolution No. 102:

1. Amended "Table '8' – Estimated Project Costs" of the Urban Renewal Plan

### RELATED CITY POLICIES

Urban Renewal Plan, Article V – Amendments to the Plan, requires a public hearing only when there is a *substantial change* to the Plan. A substantial change is defined as: "Adding land to the Urban Renewal Area, except for land that totals not more than 1% of the existing area of the urban renewal area", and "Increasing the maximum indebtedness that can be issued or incurred under the Plan." All other minor amendments shall be made by resolution of the Urban Renewal Agency. The proposed amendments do not add land to the Urban Renewal Area or increase the maximum indebtedness of the Plan. The maximum indebtedness will remain at \$13,613,603. Therefore, adoption by resolution is appropriate.

### URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY OPTIONS

1. Adopt Resolution No. 102 as proposed
2. Amend and adopt Resolution No. 102
3. Do not adopt Resolution No. 102

### CITY ADMINISTRATOR'S RECOMMENDATION

1. Adopt Resolution No. 102 as proposed

### SUGGESTED MOTION

*"I make a motion to adopt Resolution No. 102, a minor Amendment to Table 8 to the Urban Renewal Plan text as shown in Exhibit A and adopt the Urban Renewal Plan as shown in Exhibit B."*

### ATTACHMENTS

None



**THE URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY OF THE CITY OF VENETA**

**RESOLUTION NO. 102**

**A RESOLUTION PROPOSING A MINOR AMENDMENT TO THE VENETA URBAN RENEWAL PLAN, AMENDING TABLE 8 – ESTIMATED PROJECT COSTS**

**WHEREAS**, the Urban Renewal Plan of the City of Veneta (hereinafter “Plan”), was adopted by the City of Veneta on October 23, 1984 by Ordinance No. 267 and has been amended from time to time; and

**WHEREAS**, the Urban Renewal Agency of the City of Veneta (“Agency”) finds it in the public interest to amend the Plan to prioritize projects and update project cost estimates so that the urban renewal projects called for in the Plan may be completed and financed; and

**WHEREAS**, Section 5.010 of the Plan states that changes to the Plan not defined as “substantial changes” shall be considered minor amendments that may be adopted by Resolution of the Urban Renewal Agency of the City of Veneta (“Agency”); and

**WHEREAS**, the Agency has prepared the changes to Table 8 of the Plan as shown in Exhibit “A” in order to clarify and emphasize certain projects and activities; and

**WHEREAS**, the Agency finds the amendments do not increase the maximum indebtedness of the Plan; and

**WHEREAS**, the Agency finds that the proposed changes are in the public interest in that they will enhance the redevelopment of the District; and

**WHEREAS**, the Agency finds that such changes are not substantial amendments as defined by Section 5.010 of the Plan; and

**WHEREAS**, based on these recitals, the Agency finds that the minor amendments represented in the revised Plan Table 8, attached as Exhibit “A”, should be approved and adopted.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** by the Veneta Urban Renewal Agency that:

**SECTION 1 Amendment.** Table 8 – Estimated Project Costs of the Urban Renewal Plan of the City of Veneta is hereby amended to read as set forth within Exhibit “A” to this Resolution, and the amended Plan is hereby approved to read as set forth in full as Exhibit B.

**SECTION 2 Effective Date.** This Resolution shall take effect on June 8, 2015.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Veneta Urban Renewal Agency this \_\_\_\_\_  
day of \_\_\_\_\_ June, 2015.

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

\_\_\_\_\_  
Sandra H. Larson, Agency Chairperson

ATTEST:

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

\_\_\_\_\_  
Darci Henneman, City Recorder

Veneta Urban Renewal Plan - 2015 Amendment  
 Table 8 - Estimated Project Costs

<b>Projects</b>	<b>Estimated Cost (1998)</b>	<b>Estimated Future Cost (2015)</b>	<b>UR Share Incurred Expenses</b>
Highway 126 Intersection (Beautification)		30,000	
Downtown Streets (Territorial - Third)		167,000	
Downtown Streets (3rd - 5th)		140,000	
Fire Station			
City Hall Construction	\$200,000	-	266,292
Water System Development/ Debt Service	\$5,500,000	1,066,091	4,284,952
Highway 126 East Water Main			
Sewer System Development	\$1,440,000		
Jeans Road		-	
Park Development	\$1,000,000	-	187,000
Territorial (Hunter-Bolton)			
Downtown Streets (Dunham and 6th)		278,000	
Downtown Streets (5th to 8th)		-	
Downtown Improvements		-	2,041,138
Downtown Streets (8th Street and McCutcheon)			
Downtown Streets (Extension of Brooker Lane (4th-7th)			
Administrative Charges	\$1,215,000	500,000	171,863
<b>TOTAL PROJECT COSTS</b>	<b>\$ 9,355,000</b>	<b>\$2,181,091</b>	<b>\$6,951,245</b>