



## **AGENDA** **Urban Renewal District Advisory Committee**



**TUESDAY, April 2, 2013 - 5:30 p.m.**  
**City Hall Council Chambers**  
**187 SE Court Street**

---

**Chair: David Shein**

1. CALL TO ORDER
2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - Meeting of March 5, 2013
3. PUBLIC COMMENTS
4. OLD BUSINESS
  - a) Continued Discussion of Façade Grant program for 800/900 block
5. NEW BUSINESS
  - None
6. MEMBER COMMENTS
7. STAFF COMMENTS
8. OTHER BUSINESS



**CITY OF DALLAS**  
**Urban Renewal Advisory Committee**  
**Dallas City Hall**  
**187 SE Court Street, Dallas, Oregon 97338**  
**Tuesday, March 5, 2012 – 5:30 p.m.**

1 **MINUTES - DRAFT**

2 Members Present: Chair David Shein, Jim Fairchild, Nancy Adams, Randy Hunter, Rich Rohde, Joe  
3 Koubek, and Bob Brixius.

4 Absent: LaVonne Wilson, Craig Pope, Rich Long, Chelsea Pope, and Ken Jacroux.

5 Staff: Community Development Director Jason Locke and Planner John Swanson.

6 **CALL TO ORDER**

7 Chair David Shein called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

8 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

9 The minutes of the February 5, 2013, meeting were presented and approved.

10 **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

11 Lori Johnson, the new owner of half of the former Cooley’s building, introduced herself to the  
12 committee. She added that she owns commercial property in Monmouth and Independence and has  
13 offers pending on 3 other downtown Dallas properties. She stated that she is in favor of downtown  
14 improvements in Dallas and offered her support of Urban Renewal District projects.

15 **OLD BUSINESS**

16 **Continued discussion of Façade Grant program/painting for 800 / 900 blocks:**

17 Community Development Director Jason Locke opened the discussion stating his intention to narrow the  
18 focus of discussion to what we can and want to accomplish with façade improvement funding for the  
19 800 and 900 blocks. Mr. Locke said that the committee is tasked to determine priorities and make some  
20 decisions related to the \$30,000 façade improvement money programmed into the 800 / 900 block  
21 streetscape project. He further commented that we could spend the entire \$30,000 on paint alone, but  
22 there are other strong needs besides paint such as awnings, windows, signs, and building features. Mr.  
23 Locke pointed out that this project, like our other façade improvement programs are on a volunteer  
24 basis only. We don’t intend to REQUIRE improvements, but to provide incentives. He noted that we  
25 have not had many inquiries or applications to existing façade programs for some time.

26 Chair David Shein said that the paint only route may only be applicable to half the buildings and others  
27 have different needs. Mr. Shein said that we ought to look at façade improvement needs on a case-by-  
28 case, building by building basis.

29 Committee member Rich Rohde said that his goal for façade improvements is focused around signs.  
30 There are other important elements that may need addresses, he continued, but the primary objective  
31 should be signs – visibility, historical accuracy, and illumination.

32 The committee members carried on a discussion of sign issues downtown including mandatory and/or  
33 voluntary design standards, “grandfather” status of old signs, projecting signs, and methods of  
34 illumination including neon. Jason Locke emphasized that what we are proposing is not mandatory, but  
35 voluntary and that the process we create must be easy and ensure the desired result – improved  
36 streetscape. David Shein emphasized flexibility.

37 Jason Locke briefly reviewed how Urban Renewal money is accrued, and how the Urban Renewal  
38 Agency spends it as follows: The Urban Renewal District earns approximately \$105,000 per year. The  
39 Agency banks some, takes a loan to finance projects, and the remainder of the money used for debt  
40 service, which is how Urban Renewal is required to work by law. He added that, if the façade  
41 improvement effort really takes off, we could find more money than the budgeted \$30,000.

42 Rich Rohde initiated a discussion regarding incentives, stating that improvements can’t be free. Mr.  
43 Locke said that a good sign could be made for \$600 to \$800 and really nice signs could be double that.  
44 Mr. Shein remarked that the URDAC and the Agency hold the purse strings and have authority to veto  
45 extravagant or inappropriate designs. Mr. Rohde suggested a public forum for sign makers to show  
46 them what we want and for them to demonstrate their capabilities and to see a variety of designs. Staff  
47 member John Swanson stated that he and Jason Locke were scheduled to meet with Oregon Main  
48 Street in the near future and that our recent acceptance into the Main Street Program will give us access  
49 to a huge amount of downtown revitalization and design assistance and information.

50 Chair David Shein remarked that we need to develop a strategy that can be converted into policy. Jason  
51 Locke recommended packaging the program with emphasis on flexibility and variety. He said that we  
52 need a manageable process because we don’t have the staff to micro-manage the program. Chair Shein  
53 said that good projects will create momentum. If the first several facades are done well, more will  
54 follow.

55 The committee was invited to complete the project prioritization survey form attached to the agenda.  
56 The survey results will be tabulated by staff and be presented at the next URDAC meeting.

57 **NEW BUSINESS**

58 None

59 **MEMBER COMMENTS**

60 None

61 **STAFF COMMENTS**

62 None

63 **OTHER BUSINESS**

64 None

65 The meeting adjourned from City Hall at 6:35 p.m.

**City of Dallas Urban Renewal District Advisory Committee**

Results from Façade Grant prioritization survey conducted March 5, 2013

Seven surveys were submitted prioritizing six different activity categories in order as follows:

<u>(Lower number = Higher priority)</u>		<u>Priority Ranking</u>
Projecting Signs -	Avg. Score 2.5	1
Exterior Painting-	Avg. Score 3.0	2
Façade Repair -	Avg. Score 3.5	3
Repair/Replacement of Building Features	Avg. Score 4.2	4
Awnings –	Avg. Score 5.5	5
Exterior Lighting	Avg. Score 5.8	6