

CITY of LA GRANDE
Urban Renewal Agency and Urban Renewal Advisory Commission Special Session
Wednesday, August 3, 2022

[Immediately Following City Council Regular Session](#)

Council Chambers
La Grande City Hall
1000 Adams Avenue

AGENDA

The meeting will be available for viewing via the City's scheduled Charter Communications channel 180 immediately following the City Council meeting which begins at 6:00 p.m. on August 3, 2022, on the La Grande Alive website at <https://eoalive.tv/city-events/> or on the Eastern Oregon Alive.TV Facebook page at <https://www.facebook.com/EOAliveTV>.

1. URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY and URAC

- a. Call to Order
- b. Roll Call

- Per ORS 192.670(1), some Agency Members may be participating in this Regular Session by electronic communication.

2. AGENDA APPROVAL

3. CONSENT AGENDA (Agency Only)

The Consent Agenda includes routine items of business which may be approved by one Motion of the Agency. Any Agency Member so desiring may by request remove one or more items from the Consent Agenda for individual consideration under the Unfinished or New Business portion of the Agenda.

- a. Consider: Approving Regular Session Minutes; July 6, 2022
- b. Consider: Approving Special Session Minutes; July 13, 2022

4. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Those individuals who wish to address the Agency in connection with any item which is printed on tonight's Agenda may do so during the time that item is under discussion by the Agency. Individuals wishing to speak to the Agency about non-Agenda items may do so during this Public Comments portion of the Agenda. Please print your name and address on the Public Comments Sign-in Sheet, located on the podium. When addressing the Agency, speak loudly and clearly into the Podium microphone, and state your name. Persons interested in providing virtual public comments shall contact City Staff at sstockhoff@cityoflagrande.org or by calling the City Recorder at (541) 962-1309 not later than 5:00 pm the day prior to meeting to make arrangements. In the event the Mayor does not announce a time limit for comments, each speaker is asked to confine their comments to three minutes in length, whether the comments are in-person or virtual.

5. PUBLIC HEARINGS

6. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

7. NEW BUSINESS

- a. Consider: Awarding Additional Funds to the Call For Projects Program Applicants

[Strope]

8. DISTRICT MANAGER COMMENTS

9. AGENCY MEMBER COMMENTS

10. ADJOURN

Stacey M. Stockhoff
Acting City Recorder

*The Urban Renewal Agency reserves the right to convene an Executive Session for any purpose authorized under ORS 192.660
Persons requiring special accommodations who wish to attend the Agency Session are encouraged to make arrangements prior to the meeting
by calling 541-962-1309. The City of La Grande does not discriminate against individuals with disabilities*

CITY of LA GRANDE

URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY ACTION FORM

Agency Meeting Date **August 3, 2022**

PRESENTER: **Robert A. Strope, District Manager**

AGENCY ACTION: **CONSIDER CONSENT AGENDA**

- 1. MAYOR: Request Staff Report
- 2. MAYOR: Entertain Motion

Suggested Motion: I move we accept the Consent Agenda as presented.

OR

Suggested Motion: I move we accept the Consent Agenda as amended.

- 3. MAYOR: Invite Agency Discussion
- 4. MAYOR: Ask for the Vote

EXPLANATION: A Consent Agenda includes routine items of business with limited public interest, which may be approved by one Motion of the Agency. Any Agency Member may, by request, remove any item of business from the Consent Agenda.

- a. **Consider:** Approving Regular Session Minutes; July 6, 2022
- b. **Consider:** Approving Special Session Minutes; July 13, 2022

Reviewed By: (Initial)

District Manager _____
City Recorder _____
Aquatics Division _____
Building Department _____
ED Department _____
Finance _____
Fire Department _____

Human Resources Dept _____
Library _____
Parks Department _____
Planning Department _____
Police Department _____
Public Works Department _____

AGENCY ACTION (Office Use Only)

- Motion Passed
- Motion Failed; _____
- Action Tabled: _____
Vote: _____
- Resolution Passed
Effective Date: _____
- Ordinance Adopted
First Reading: _____
Second Reading: _____
Effective Date: _____

CITY OF LA GRANDE

Urban Renewal Agency Regular Session

July 6, 2022

Immediately following City Council Regular Session

Council Chambers
La Grande City Hall
1000 Adams Avenue

MINUTES

AGENCY MEMBERS PRESENT:

Stephen E. Clements, *Mayor*
Gary Lillard, *Mayor Pro Tem (Attended via electronic device)*
John Bozarth, *Agency Member*
David Glabe, *Agency Member*
Mary Ann Miesner, *Agency Member (arrived at 7:09 p.m.) (Attended via electronic device)*
Justin Rock, *Agency Member*

AGENCY MEMBERS ABSENT EXCUSED:

Nicole Howard, *Agency Member*

STAFF PRESENT

Michael Boquist, *Community Development Director/Interim District Manager*
Kayla Brainerd, *Assistant to the District Manager*
Stacey Stockhoff, *Acting City Recorder*
Gary Bell, *Police Chief*
Timothy Bishop, *Economic Development Director*
Kyle Carpenter, *Public Works Director (Attended via electronic device)*
Emmitt Cornford, *Fire Chief*
Stu Spence, *Parks and Recreation Director*

Per ORS 192.670(1), some Agency Members and Staff participated in this Regular Session by electronic communication.

CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL/AGENDA APPROVAL

Mayor CLEMENTS called this Regular Session of the Urban Renewal Agency to order at 7:08 p.m.; Roll Call was taken; and a quorum was determined to be present.

CONSENT AGENDA

- a. **Consider:** Approving Regular Session Minutes; June 1, 2022

The following Motion was introduced by ROCK; BOZARTH providing the Second:

MOTION: I move that we accept the Consent Agenda as presented.

(Note: Councilor MIESNER joined the meeting at 7:09 p.m.)

VOTE

MSC. (unanimous)

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None

PUBLIC HEARINGS

None

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None

NEW BUSINESS

- a. **Consider:** Approving Recommended Changes to The Call For Projects Policy

STAFF REPORT

Mayor CLEMENTS requested the Staff Report.

Timothy BISHOP, *Economic Development Director*

BISHOP stated that at the Wednesday, March 2, 2022, Urban Renewal Agency meeting, the Agency amended the Call For Projects (CFP) Policy including adding a section providing preference points to encourage additional residential development on upper floors in the Central Business Zone (CBZ). The change also removed the requirement for the such projects to include retail improvements on the ground floor to be eligible for funding *if it was located within the CBZ*.

BISHOP noted that in reviewing one of the submissions for the 2022 Call for Projects (CFP), a gap was discovered in the scoring model. Specifically, under the "Impact on Central Business Zone" criteria, there was not a provision for a Housing/Residential only project located in the CBZ. On Wednesday, May 4, 2022, the District Manager informed the Agency and the Urban Renewal Advisory Commission (URAC) of this oversight and indicated that Staff would be allocating twenty-five (25) points for this type of project when scoring the CFP submissions with the understanding that the Agency would need to approve the policy change prior to the July Special Session to award project funding. The draft also removed unneeded language in the final paragraph of the policy.

In response to allocating twenty-five (25) points for the new criteria, Mayor CLEMENTS asked if that was added to reflect desire for residential development above ground floor in the downtown area, to which BISHOP responded yes. It was his understanding that the Agency wanted to allocate points to projects that included increasing residential development, particularly within the Central Business Zone.

GLABE asked for clarification on the new criteria, to which BISHOP responded that historically, when someone was working on a building renovation downtown, this particular clause was added in the event there was already an existing ground floor tenant and the only work being completed was

for a residential housing conversion of an upper floor. That particular clause was only relevant within the Central Business Zone (CBZ).

Mayor CLEMENTS asked where the boundary location of the Central Business Zone was, to which BISHOP responded it runs from 4th Street to Island Avenue and includes Adams Avenue, Jefferson Avenue, and Washington Avenue. (Editorial Note: The CBZ ends at Greenwood Street, not Island Avenue. The south boundary of the CBZ is Spring Street, not Washington Avenue).

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None

AGENCY DISCUSSION

None

MOTION

The following Motion was introduced by MIESNER; GLABE providing the Second:

MOTION: I move that the Agency amend the Call For Projects Policy to add to a new scoring criteria under “Impact on Central Business Zone” for a Housing/Residential only project located in the CBZ as presented.

AGENCY DISCUSSION

None

VOTE

MSC. (unanimous)

- b. **Consider:** Approving Citizen to Urban Renewal Advisory Commission;
Rikki Jo Hickey

Mayor CLEMENTS briefly explained the process for appointing citizens to the City of La Grande’s Urban Renewal Advisory Commission.

MOTION

The following Motion was introduced by CLEMENTS; ROCK providing the Second:

MOTION: I move that Rikki Jo Hickey be appointed to the Urban Renewal Advisory Commission for the remainder of a three-year term which will expire on December 31, 2024.

AGENCY DISCUSSION

ROCK confirmed that appointing this applicant would result in a full Commission.

VOTE

MSC. (unanimous)

DISTRICT MANAGER COMMENTS

None

AGENCY MEMBER COMMENTS

Mayor CLEMENTS reminded the Agency that a Joint Special Session Meeting for the Call For Projects Program was scheduled for Wednesday, July 13, 2022.

ADJOURN

There being no further business to come before this Regular Session of the Agency, Mayor CLEMENTS adjourned the meeting at 7:18 p.m.

ATTEST:

APPROVED:

Kayla A. Brainerd
Assistant to the District Manager

Stephen E. Clements
Mayor

APPROVED: _____

CITY OF LA GRANDE

Urban Renewal Agency and Urban Renewal Advisory Commission Joint Session

July 13, 2022

Council Chambers
La Grande City Hall
1000 Adams Avenue

MINUTES

AGENCY MEMBERS PRESENT:

Steve Clements, *Mayor*
John Bozarth, *Agency Member*
David Glabe, *Agency Member*
Mary Ann Miesner, *Agency Member*
Justin Rock, *Agency Member*

AGENCY MEMBERS ABSENT EXCUSED:

Nicole Howard, *Agency Member*
Gary Lillard, *Mayor Pro Tem*

URBAN RENEWAL ADVISORY COMMISSION MEMBERS:

Lauren Babcock
Alana Carollo
Rikki Jo Hickey
Roxie Ogilvie
Matt Scarfo

STAFF PRESENT

Robert Strobe, *District Manager*
Stacey Stockhoff, *Acting City Recorder*
Timothy Bishop, *Economic Development Director*

ROLL CALL

Mayor CLEMENTS called this Joint Session of the Urban Renewal Agency and Urban Renewal Advisory Commission to order at 6:00 p.m.; Roll Call was taken; and a quorum was determined to be present.

NEW BUSINESS

a. Consider: Award Funding, Call for Projects

CONFLICT OF INTEREST/DECLARATIONS

None

STAFF REPORT

Mayor CLEMENTS requested the Staff Report.

Timothy BISHOP, Economic Development Director

BISHOP stated that the Urban Renewal Agency advertised that it would be accepting applications for grant funding under the Fiscal Year 2022-2023 discretionary Call for Projects Program with applications due by May 27, 2022. The Agency received six (6) complete applications. The adopted budget for this program contained \$350,000 for

projects that were not located within the La Grande Business and Technology Park. There were no projects submitted for the La Grande Business and Technology Park, therefore the \$225,000 budgeted for these types of projects would not be allocated in this round of funding. Based on the applicants' stated project values, the total value for these six (6) projects was \$1,521,861 with total grant requests of \$399,453. Staff attributed the increase in the number of projects and the size of projects to additional staff outreach and the ongoing recovery from COVID-19.

BISHOP noted that the Agency approved the current policy for this program on Wednesday, July 6, 2022. On Wednesday, March 2, 2022, an important change to the Call for Projects policy expanding the eligibility of funds for residential development on upper floors within the Central Business Zone and adjusting the evaluation matrix to include points based on the number of new dwelling units created. The Agency also removed the "Community Comment" requirement from the application. Consistent with policy revisions made in 2019, "Once projects are evaluated and ranked per criteria in Subsection 6, available funds will be allocated to projects in order of ranking, highest to lowest, with projects receiving the full amount requested until the funding is exhausted."

BISHOP mentioned that in the Call for Projects packets that the Agency and the Urban Renewal Advisory Commission (URAC) received, there were Scoring Sheets included that were requested to be returned to the District Manager no later than 5:00 p.m. on Friday, July 8, 2022. Following the Staff presentation, Agency/URAC members would discuss the projects and share any information that may have been gained by individual Agency/URAC members through site visits, contact with applicants, Staff and/or members of the public. Following the discussion, Agency/URAC members would individually award up to forty (40) points per project using forms provided and turn them into Staff. During the Break, Staff would compile the scores and order rank the projects. Staff would display the spreadsheet showing the project scoring and funding amounts allocated as prescribed in the Call for Projects Policy Section C. General Criteria 3). The Agency/URAC would then vote to approve the funding. No public comments, or comments by the applicants, would be entertained during this Agenda Item. Following Agency and URAC discussions, the Mayor would ask for a motion to approve project funding as discussed. The Agency was reminded that they were not obligated to award all funding in the Budget. Funds for approved projects would be available immediately given the Budget has been adopted. Applicants with approved funding would be required to enter into a funding agreement with the Agency prior to receiving funds.

BISHOP presented the following projects:

Bohnenkamp Building

- ❖ Applicant Name: Mavis Hartz
- ❖ Location: 1301 Adams Avenue
La Grande, OR 97850

Project Description:

- Project includes exterior restoration including windows and awning, seismic and code upgrades, and creation of three (3) residential units on the 2nd floor.

Project Highlights:

- Renovation includes significant seismic and code compliance upgrades to this iconic building in the Central Business Zone.
- Project addresses *Goal 1: Revitalize Downtown* by revitalizing this commercial property. *Goal 2: Create High Quality Family Wage Jobs* by creating one (1) additional job. *Goal 4: Housing* creates downtown housing on upper floors.
- Total Project Cost: \$784,000
- URA Funding Request: \$ 75,000
- Maximum Eligible Funding: \$ 75,000

Country Financial

- ❖ Applicant Name: Paul Swigert
- ❖ Location: 1212 Adams Avenue
La Grande, OR 97850

Project Description:

- This is a residential only project adding 1 unit on the 2nd floor of the Country Financial building.

Project Highlights:

- Construction of one (1) additional apartment.
- Exterior paint and masonry repair.
- Pave existing parking in rear of the building.
- Project addresses Goals 1 and 4 of the Urban Renewal Plan. *Goal 1: Revitalizes Downtown* by renovating 2nd floor space bringing the building to 100% occupancy. *Goal 4: Housing* adding one (1) additional apartment on the 2nd floor.
- Total Project Cost: \$ 76,496
- URA Funding Request: \$ 38,248
- Maximum Eligible Funding: \$ 33,508

Evermine Label Company

- ❖ Applicant Name: David and Jeanne Williamson
- ❖ Location: 1124 Washington Avenue
La Grande, OR 97850

Project Description:

- Renovates single story addition to the former Elks building to house Evermine Label Company relocating from Portland.

Project Highlights:

- Renovation of the entire mid-century addition to accommodate reuse as production space for the Evermine Label Company.
 - Project includes significant code compliance updates, new HVAC, loading dock and creation of both production and design/administrative spaces.
 - Project addresses Goals 1, 2 and 3 of the Urban Renewal Plan. *Goal 1: Revitalizes Downtown* by renovating a major portion of the former Elks Building for new use. *Goal 2: Create High Quality Family Wage Jobs* project is expected to create 8-10 new jobs. *Goal 3: Retail Development* activate the Washington Street frontage with retail coffee shop/bookstore.
- Total Project Cost: \$184,605
 - URA Funding Request: \$ 75,000
 - Maximum Eligible Funding: \$ 75,000

Front Office Solutions

- ❖ Applicant Name: Jeremy Kilpatrick
- ❖ Location: 1209 Adams Avenue
La Grande, OR 97850

Project Description:

- The project includes replacing the roof and façade improvements to the former Kettle Korn and More building.

Project Highlights:

- Replace the roof and repair structural damage.
 - Remove and replace the awning, remove the lava stone façade and replace with period appropriate storefront.
 - This project addresses Goal 1 of the Urban Renewal Plan. *Goal 1: Revitalize Downtown*, by renovating this very visible commercial property, making it more period appropriate to the district and facilitating the retention of a commercial business.
- Total Project Cost: \$131,312
 - URA Funding Request: \$ 65,656
 - Maximum Eligible Funding: \$ 65,656

Smokehouse Restaurant

- ❖ Applicant Name: Matt and Amanda Rainwater
- ❖ Location: 2208 Adams Avenue
La Grande, OR 97850

Project Description:

- Structural and aesthetic improvements to the Smokehouse restaurant.

Project Highlights:

- Project includes repaving the parking lot repair/replacement of awning, replace exterior lighting, new HVAC, ADA compliant restrooms and replacing windows for energy efficiency.

- Project addresses *Goal 1: Revitalize Downtown*. Though outside the CBZ, this locally owned restaurant project supports downtown's efforts to promote local eateries. Potential job growth is suggested but would not likely meet the criteria for Goal 2 of the Urban Renewal Plan.
- Total Project Cost: \$141,098
- URA Funding Request: \$ 70,549
- Maximum Eligible Funding: \$ 70,549

The Local Kitchen

- ❖ Applicant Name: Gust Tsiatsos & Rhonda McPhetridge
- ❖ Location: 2210 Jefferson Avenue
La Grande, OR 97850

Project Description:

- This project converts one (1) bay of this warehouse into a commercial kitchen with walk in freezer to serve as the commercial kitchen and ice cream production facility for The Local Coffee Shop.

Project Highlights:

- Project will include new electrical, HVAC and plumbing to support the new use, installation of a walk in freezer, new windows and replace the garage door.
- This project addresses Goals 1 and 2. *Goal 1: Revitalize Downtown* by repurposing this space to support the business expansion of The Local. *Goal 2: Create High Quality Family Wage Jobs*. This project creates 3 new jobs.
- Total Project Cost: \$204,350
- URA Funding Request: \$ 75,000
- Maximum Eligible Funding: \$ 64,180

AGENCY DISCUSSION

BOZARTH asked what was considered a *Family Wage Job*, to which BISHOP stated that he believed it was a job that paid over \$20/hour. After further discussion, BISHOP realized that he made a mistake on The Local Kitchen's application. It showed that the project would meet the criteria to satisfy Goal 2 by creating *Family Wage Jobs*, which was incorrect.

In response to the clarification request from Mayor CLEMENTS regarding the grant that was awarded to the Bohnenkamp Building Project, BISHOP confirmed that the \$200,000 Oregon Main Street Revitalization Grant was awarded.

BOZARTH asked if the \$419,000 loan for the Bohnenkamp Building Project was approved, to which BISHOP answered that the applicant did receive a letter from the Financial Institution which indicated approved access to those funds.

In regards to the Bohnenkamp Building Project, CAROLLO asked what the Brownsfield EPA Grant timeline looked like and what the funds for this grant would be used towards. BISHOP stated that this grant was still in the early stages in the process and he did not have an answer to share at this time.

In response to MIESNER's request for clarification on whether or not the Bohnenkamp Building Project had already been presented to the Landmarks Commission for approval, BISHOP answered that the project had not gone through the approval process yet, but would as part of the full process of completion. A discussion was held regarding the elements that needed to be finalized during the review process.

MIESNER asked how many apartments would be built for this project, to which BISHOP stated three (3) apartments on the 2nd floor. A discussion was held regarding parking for the tenants who would occupy these apartments.

In response to MIESNER's request for clarification in regards to ADA Accessibility for neither the Bohnenkamp Building project nor the County Financial project, BISHOP confirmed that she was correct that these two (2) projects were not ADA Compliant at this time. A discussion was held regarding the potential to install an elevator in the Bohnenkamp Building in the future.

MIESNER asked if the Country Financial Project had parking already established for the two (2) apartments, to which BISHOP confirmed that there were already parking spots available to the tenants. He explained that the application included repaving these parking spots and added that this project was exempt from installing covered parking.

CAROLLO asked for an explanation regarding the masonry work to be completed on Unit One (1), to which BISHOP stated that the windows on Unit One (1) were to be filled in with masonry subject to the Landmarks Commission's approval and explained that it was a safety issue.

In response to CAROLLO's question regarding the bids submitted for both units, BISHOP stated that those were the current bids that were turned in with the application.

BISHOP held up the map drawing of the Country Financial Project to explain where things were located in comparison to the outside street view.

Mayor CLEMENTS commented that he was pleased to see that Evermine Label Company was repurposing this piece of property for their business.

In response to Mayor CLEMENTS' request, BISHOP stated that the scope of work for the Evermine Label Company Project was to improve the main floor of the building to house the production space for the business as well as renovate a space for a bookstore/coffee café. He also explained where the loading dock would be located.

GLABE asked about the apartment that was being built, to which BISHOP stated that this was not for residential use and it would be used for short-lived stays for visiting designers or technicians working on the building.

HICKEY commented that the Business Plan for the Evermine Label Company Project mentioned bringing several staff members with them for the relocation of their business, but asked for clarification on the additional staff from the local population, to which BISHOP stated that they were hoping to hire approximately four (4) to six (6) more employee from our local community.

In response to Mayor CLEMENTS' question regarding Kettle Corn and More that was located in the front part of the building where Front Office Solutions. BISHOP confirmed that Kettle Corn was leasing that section of the building and had closed the business approximately eight (8) months ago.

MIESNER asked about the lava stone removal on the outside of the building, to which BISHOP clarified that the owners were planning on removing the lava stone from both the front and the side, and replacing it with brick.

In response to GLABE's question regarding the awning that Front Office Solutions would replace, BISHOP confirmed that the awning request would need to be approved by the Landmarks Commission and assured him that the design would have to comply with the design standards.

Mayor CLEMENTS asked if Front Office Solutions did not receive funding whether or not they would be eligible for a Façade Grant. BISHOP explained that they would not be able to combine both Call for Projects and a Façade Grant together, but the owners' priority was the structural repairs and the roof repair at this time. If they did not receive the funding under Call for Projects, they would complete the immediate repairs to the building and hold off on the exterior improvements until another time.

Mayor CLEMENTS' voiced that he was glad to see the Smokehouse Restaurant apply for Call for Projects because it was a visual element that people see as they drive through that section of La Grande.

MIESNER asked if the Smokehouse Restaurant Project started their parking lot repairs, to which **BISHOP** stated yes. Due to high demand to hire a contractor, the owners had a short notice opportunity to start early on the pavement repair, so they turned in an early request application in order to start the repairs now.

With new owners of the Smokehouse Restaurant, Mayor **CLEMENTS** pointed out that they have implemented and updated several different things in the last two (2) years since taking over the family business.

In response to **MIESNER**'s question as to why The Landing Hotel's kitchen would not be able to accommodate the needs for The Local Kitchen Project, **BISHOP** answered that neither The Landing Hotel nor The Local currently have the space needed for a full walk-in cooler or storage capacity needed for this project.

A discussion was held explaining where the walk-in cooler would be located inside the renovated space.

MIESNER asked what type of door would be installed for the bay, to which **BISHOP** stated that he was unclear on the details.

In regards to the cash flow projections under the Business Plan for The Local Kitchen Project, **CAROLLO** asked if this space would be used for an entrepreneur or community space as well, to which **BISHOP** stated that the primary purpose outlined in their application would be for producing product to service their two (2) businesses, predominantly The Local, at this time.

In response to **MIESNER**'s earlier inquiry regarding the doors, **STROPE** verified that The Local would be using the existing doors that were already there.

SCARFO asked if the Health Inspector had been notified regarding the The Local Kitchen Project conversion and renovation, to which **BISHOP** stated that the owner would be required to follow through with the process of obtaining all permits before using the space once project was complete. A discussion was held regarding when the funding for this project would be available to the applicant, if approved.

MIESNER asked for clarification on how much space this project would occupy inside the storage building, to which **BISHOP** stated that the conversion would be on the left side of the building only. The front piece in front of the bay would be rendered as possible office space.

STROPE clarified that all of the projects were required to receive all of the permitting and obtain a Certificate of Occupancy, if applicable, before final payment was released.

In response to BOZARTH's question regarding early payment when receipts have been turned in, STROPE added that the applicant would be able to receive one (1) progress payment depending upon the size of the project. BOZARTH asked if the applicant received partial payment and was not able to receive all permitting at the end of the project, would they pay back the funds that were give to them, to which STROPE explained that if the applicant was not able to complete the project, the option for granting the applicant more time with an agreement should be sufficient. There was also a provision in the Call for Projects Policy that would allow the Agency to place a lien on the property, if necessary. Otherwise, yes, the applicant would be required to pay back the Urban Renewal Agency funds that were paid out to them if they did not finish the project.

Under the cost estimate breakdown for The Local Kitchen Project, OGILVIE asked for clarification on the *Contingency* line added under the Project Cost page, to which BISHOP stated that was added in there due to fluctuations or unexpected costs for repairs.

BISHOP thanked everyone for their participation in the meeting and was excited about the projects.

Under the Business Plan (section H and I) for the Country Financial Project, HICKEY asked if the projection was accurate for the property management income because it seemed quite low to her. BISHOP replied that he did not have an answer for that question.

In response to BOZARTH's earlier question regarding *Family Wage Jobs*, BABCOCK clarified that a *Family Wage Job* was considered a job that brought in approximately \$45,000 per year.

STROPE gave a brief overview of how the scoring system worked once all scores have been collected.

A brief discussion was held regarding what to take into consideration when issuing individual scores.

In regards to The Local Kitchen Project, CAROLLO pointed out that Schedule B listed a flat fee figure that was quite larger than the projected cost and asked why the difference, to which BISHOP replied that he did not have an answer for that question.

RECESSED

Mayor CLEMENTS recessed the meeting at 7:09 p.m. to allow the Agency Members to score the applications and submit their scoring to Staff.

RECONVENE

Mayor CLEMENTS reconvened the meeting at 7:21 p.m. and invited Staff to present scoring results.

District Manager STROPE presented the results from the Staff and Agency scoring.

AGENCY DISCUSSION

A discussion was held regarding the average scores given to the projects by the Agency and options on the breakdown of funding for each project. They were as follows:

Non-Business Park Applicant(s)				
Project Name	Staff Scores	Agency Average Scores	Total Score	Funding Amount
Bohnenkamp Building	135	86	221	\$75,000
Country Financial	45	67	112	0
Evermine Label Co.	100	79	179	\$75,000
Front Office Solutions	60	72	132	\$65,656
Smokehouse Restaurant	50	72	122	\$70,164
The Local Kitchen	85	55	140	\$64,180
Business Park Applicant(s)				
None				

AGENCY DISCUSSION

SCARFO was surprised to see that Country Financial scored in the 6th position.

HICKEY asked if the applicants were encouraged to reapply in the future if they were not awarded funding, to which STROPE stated that it would depend on if the project was already constructed or not. In some cases, there may be a project that would qualify for a Façade Grant.

STROPE clarified how the Staff Scoring was calculated for each project, depending on the criteria in the policy.

BOZARTH asked if there was a way to do a supplemental budget for the Urban Renewal Agency so that all of the projects could be funded this round, to which STROPE stated that it would not require a supplemental budget but the Agency would have to vote to move funds from another line in the budget to provide additional funds. He suggested that a further discussion be continued at the next Urban Renewal Agency meeting scheduled for Wednesday, August 3, 2022.

Since there were no Business Park applicants in this year's Call for Projects, OGILVIE asked if those funds could be used to fully fund the remaining projects in this round, to which STROPE stated that the intent was to keep the Business Park funds separated from the other program funds. If not used, those would be rolled over into the next year's round of funding. If the dollars were moved, it would take away from the allocated amount for next year.

Mayor CLEMENTS encouraged the URAC members to be part of the conversation at next month's meeting.

MOTION

The following Motion was introduced by MIESNER; BOZARTH Second:

Motion: I move approval of funding for the Call for Projects in the amounts as discussed.

VOTE

MSC. FIVE (5) of the Agency Members and FIVE (5) of the Urban Renewal Advisory Commission Members present voted in the affirmative; HOWARD and LILLARD were absent excused.

DISTRICT MANAGER COMMENTS

None

AGENCY MEMBER COMMENTS

None

There being no further business to come before this Joint Session of the Agency and the Urban Renewal Advisory Commission, Mayor CLEMENTS adjourned the meeting at 7:31 p.m.

ATTEST:

APPROVED:

Stacey M. Stockhoff
Acting City Recorder

Stephen E. Clements
Mayor

APPROVED: _____

CITY of LA GRANDE

URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY ACTION FORM

Agency Meeting Date: **August 3, 2022**

PRESENTER:

Robert A. Strope, District Manager

AGENCY ACTION:

CONSIDER AWARDING ADDITIONAL FUNDS TO THE CALL FOR PROJECTS PROGRAM APPLICANTS

1. MAYOR: Request Staff Report
2. MAYOR: Invite Public Comments
3. MAYOR: Invite Agency/URAC Discussion
4. MAYOR: Entertain Motion

Suggested Motion One: I move approval of increased funding for the Call for Projects applicants as discussed (or individual votes on the two projects)

5. MAYOR: Invite Additional Agency/URAC Discussion
6. MAYOR: Ask for the Vote

EXPLANATION: At the Wednesday, July 13, 2022, Joint Special Session of the Agency and Urban Renewal Advisory Commission (URAC), full funding was awarded for four (4) of the six (6) projects. The fifth ranked project was awarded \$70,164, which is \$385 less than the eligible amount of \$70,549. The sixth ranked project did not receive any of the \$33,508 eligible amount. The approved Call for Projects (CFP) policy, Section C. 3) reads as follows: *“Once projects are evaluated and ranked per criteria in Subsection 6, available funds will be allocated to projects in order of ranking, highest to lowest, with projects receiving the full amount requested until the funding is exhausted.”*

Following the funding decision, the applicant for The Local Kitchen declined their award of \$64,180. Given the timing, Staff is recommending the Agency and URAC consider allocating additional funding to those projects which did not receive full funding. Below is the scoring for the projects from the July 13th Special Session:

Project	Staff Scores					Agency/URAC Average Scores				Total Scores	Funding (Agency Adopted Budget \$350,000)			
	Impact on Central Business Zone 60 Points	Private Investment to Public Dollars 30 Points	Return on Investment 50 Points	Upper Floor Residential CBZ 15 Points	Subtotal:	Blight 30 Points	Business Viability and Project Readiness 25 Points	Subtotal:	Overall 40 Points	Total 250 Points	Total Project Cost	Requested Amount	Eligible Amount	Agency/URAC Approved Funding
Bohnenkamp	45	30	50	10	135	25	22	47	39	221	\$ 784,000	\$ 75,000	\$ 75,000	\$ 75,000
Country Financial	25	5	10	5	45	17	22	40	28	113	\$ 76,496	\$ 38,248	\$ 33,508	\$ -
Evermine Label	60	20	20	0	100	19	23	42	37	179	\$ 184,605	\$ 75,000	\$ 75,000	\$ 75,000
Front Office	35	15	10	0	60	18	19	37	35	132	\$ 131,312	\$ 65,656	\$ 65,656	\$ 65,656
Smokehouse	30	10	10	0	50	17	21	38	34	122	\$ 141,098	\$ 70,549	\$ 70,549	\$ 70,164
The Local Kitchen	40	25	20	0	85	11	20	32	24	141	\$ 204,350	\$ 75,000	\$ 64,180	\$ 64,180
										Totals	\$ 1,521,861	\$ 399,453	\$ 383,893	\$ 350,000

Based on the CFP Policy, should the Agency/URAC elect to award the funding declined by The Local Kitchen to the other projects, the revised funding awards would be \$70,549 for Smokehouse (\$385 increase) and \$33,508 for Country Financial (\$33,508 increase).

Reviewed By: (Initial)

District Manager _____
 City Recorder _____
 Aquatics Division _____
 Building Department _____
 ED Department _____
 Finance _____
 Fire Department _____

Human Resources Dept _____
 Library _____
 Parks Department _____
 Planning Department _____
 Police Department _____
 Public Works Department _____

AGENCY ACTION (Office Use Only)

- Motion Passed
- Motion Failed; _____
- Action Tabled: _____
 Vote: _____
- Resolution Passed
 Effective Date: _____
- Ordinance Adopted
 First Reading: _____
 Second Reading: _____
 Effective Date: _____