

CITY OF SILVERTON

**URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY SPECIAL MEETING – 6:00 p.m., June 17, 2019**

---

---

**Silverton Community Center – Council Chambers – 421 S. Water St., Silverton, OR**

*American with Disabilities Act (A.D.A.) – The City of Silverton intends to comply with the A.D.A. The meeting location is accessible to individuals needing special accommodations such as a sign language interpreter, headphones, or other special accommodations for the hearing impaired. To participate, please contact the City Clerk at 503-874-2216 at least 48 hours prior to the meeting.*

*A copy of the packet and materials, are available for review Monday through Friday 8:00 am to 5:00 pm in the City Manager's Office at the Silverton City Hall, located at 306 South Water Street. All documents will be available on our website at [www.silverton.or.us](http://www.silverton.or.us).*

**AGENDA**

- I. **OPENING CEREMONIES: Call to Order, Pledge of Allegiance & Roll Call**
- II. **PUBLIC COMMENT** – Items not on the agenda
- III. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES** – Minutes from the Special Meeting held on February 6, 2019 and the Regular Meeting held on March 4, 2019
- IV. **DISCUSSION/ACTION** – None submitted
- V. **PUBLIC HEARING** – A Public Hearing to give citizens an opportunity to comment on the approved budget for Fiscal Year 2019-2020
  - 5.1 **Resolution No. 2019-01 – A resolution to adopt the Budget for Fiscal Year 2019-2020, declare tax increment, and make appropriations**
- VI. **ADJOURNMENT**

1 CITY OF SILVERTON  
2 **URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES**

3 **Silverton Community Center – Council Chambers – 421 South Water St.**

4  
5 **Date: February 6, 2019 at 6:00 p.m.**

6  
7 **I. OPENING CEREMONIES – Call to Order, Pledge of Allegiance & Roll Call**

8  
9 Chairman Palmer called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m.

Present	Absent	
X		Chairman Kyle Palmer
X		Jason Freilinger
X		Laurie Carter
X		Jim Sears
X		Dana Smith
X		Matt Plummer
	Excused	Crystal Neideigh

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27 Staff Present:

28 Agency Director, Christy Wurster and Assistant to the City Manager/City Clerk, Angela Speier

29  
30 **II. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

31  
32 **2.1 Fiscal Year 2019-2020 Goal Setting – Sean O’Day, Mid-Willamette Valley Council of Governments**

33 Sean O’Day, Executive Director for the Mid-Willamette Valley Council of Governments (MWVCOG) introduced himself and explained that leading goal setting sessions is one of the services that MWVCOG offers their members. He described his background and the reason why goal setting is important for cities. He explained that goals help keep elected officials and staff focused on projects and encouraged members to remove goals that have become routine tasks. To help guide the thinking about goals the Agency and City Council should divide the projects into three buckets: strategic, operational, and tactical. The three areas overlap, but strategic is an assessment of where the City is today, where you want to go and the road that you are going to build to get there. Operational is the plan on how to accomplish the strategic goal and tactical is the specifics on what materials it will take to get there. He encouraged the members to focus on the strategic and operational levels and avoid the tactical level which is more staff focused.

34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46 Councilor Freilinger reviewed the goals for the Urban Renewal Advisory Committee (URAC):

- 47 1. Request for Proposal (RFP) for downtown improvements, including a construction management plan;
- 48 2. Request to review the grant and loan programs;
- 49 3. Traffic circulation studies for the downtown and Silverton Road/C Street area;
- 50 4. Affordable housing options utilizing urban renewal; and
- 51 5. Work session with URA and SURAC.
- 52  
53

54 The Agency reviewed the goal and updated the objectives as noted in Attachment 1. The agency has one goal and the members would like to keep the language as is.

55  
56

1 **Objective 1.1**

2 City Council will be considering the Urban Renewal District expansion at their March 4, 2019 meeting,  
3 thus this objective was removed from the list.  
4

5 **Objective 1.2 (now Objective 1.1)**

6 Agency members would like to keep this objective separate and make it clear that they first want to know  
7 the cost to underground utilities in the downtown and then will make a determination to move forward.  
8 Agency Director Wurster said that this project has been assigned to the new City Engineer. Member  
9 Carter said what killed the plan in 2011 were two public issues that brought a lot of concern from the  
10 community, the first was closing Main Street and the second was the need to remove the mature trees.  
11 Mr. O'Day explained that there are ways to underground utilities, the first is a state law where local  
12 governments can require the utility to underground, but the utilities can pass that cost on to the rate  
13 payers. The other option is to require the undergrounding and the city or URA would cover the cost. This  
14 objective is to determine the cost implications for each of the undergrounding options. Agency Director  
15 Wurster said that the Urban Renewal Plan designates \$2.5 million for government/City buildings; \$2  
16 million for streetscape improvements; and \$500,000 for downtown plan planning. She explained that  
17 doesn't mean the agency has the cash readily available and would most likely need to leverage the  
18 URA's financing option to obtain the money.  
19

20 **Objective 1.3 (now Objective 1.2)**

21 Staff added in a list of studies that need to take place to accomplish this objective. Language was added  
22 to include the URAC's goal to issue a RFP upon the completion of the studies.  
23

24 **Objective 1.4 (now Objective 1.3)**

25 The Agency agreed to keep the language as is.  
26

27 **Objective 1.5 (now Objective 1.4)**

28 Member Smith explained that a couple items on the Council goal list tie into this goal. The first is how  
29 much the URA will participate in the North 2<sup>nd</sup> Street improvements and if there are any other  
30 enhancements that happen at the 1<sup>st</sup> and Jefferson intersection such as traffic calming measures that  
31 might be desired. The language was amended to include these measures.  
32

33 **Objective 1.6 (now Objective 1.5)**

34 Member Freilinger said that the URAC is in support of this goal and exploring the possibility of using the  
35 Westfield property for affordable housing. He said that there was discussion about using URA funds for  
36 multifamily housing. Member Carter said that she feels that the City should be encouraging the  
37 development through incentives. Member Freilinger said he would like to see the City create R-10 high  
38 density zoning for housing. Agency Director Wurster explained that staff would like to issue a RFP to the  
39 development community regarding possible uses for the Westfield property. Staff will work with Council  
40 during a work session to make sure everything they want to see is included in the RFP and it will be  
41 written broadly enough to garner ideas that might not have been thought of. Mr. O'Day explained a similar  
42 process that was used in Salem and stated it is a great way to solicit ideas from the development  
43 community. The agency decided to keep the language as is.  
44

45 **New Objective 1.6**

46 Member Freilinger explained that two of the URAC goals could be combined, because they want to hold a  
47 joint work session with the URA to develop grant and loan program criteria and methodology. This would  
48 allow the URA and URAC to be on the same page when looking at grant and loan applications. Agency  
49 Director Wurster said that a Work Session to review the guidelines has been scheduled for April.  
50 Members indicated that they would like to invite the URAC to participate in this meeting. Mr. O'Day asked  
51 if the current methodology takes into account jobs created, increases in assessed value, and aesthetics.  
52 Members explained the current process. He asked what the strategic goal is; is it to create jobs, improve  
53 the assessed value, beautify downtown, or is it all three. He further asked if the Agency is using those  
54 filters when they make loan and grant decisions and what constitutes a grant verses a loan. He explained  
55 in his experience, generally speaking, if the project is going to enhance the property owner's ability to  
56 make money then it would put in the form of a low interest loan through a revolving loan program. In the  
57 case of a kitchen improvement where the property owner will be making money the agency would provide  
58 seed money, but would want the money paid back in order to reinvest it in other job creating programs

1 within the urban renewal area. If the project is a beautification project, like a façade improvement or a  
2 streetscape improvement then it would look more like a grant, because the property owner isn't  
3 necessarily going to be generating any income from that project in order to pay back the loan. He said  
4 that these are policy choices that need to be developed through a strategic lens. He also said that the  
5 MWVCOG can help member cities administer a small loan revolving program. Discussion ensued about  
6 possible grant verse loan criteria. Councilor Carter said that she sees global warming as Oregon's biggest  
7 threat and would like to see a requirement when giving grants and loans that green building practices  
8 such as using renewable energy and green canopies be required. Discussion ensued about making this  
9 part of the City goals and discussing it further at the April Work Session. Member Freilinger asked about  
10 façade improvements which wouldn't necessarily be able to add a green component into their project. Mr.  
11 O'Day explained that the City might want to develop a Sustainability Plan in order to meet Councilor  
12 Carter's proposed criteria.

13  
14 **New Objective 1.7**

15 Member Freilinger said that last goal discussed by the URAC was to conduct a traffic circulation study for  
16 the downtown area and Silverton Road/C Street. Discussion ensued about the city-wide study that the  
17 Public Works Director has been reporting on and how this would fit into that.

18  
19 **New Objective 1.8**

20 Member Sears said that there is \$500,000 set aside in the Urban Renewal Plan for gateways. He would  
21 like to see a goal to improve the gateways into town. Since the City will be improving McClaine Street he  
22 indicated that there is a vacant piece of property as you enter town that could be used to create a garden  
23 or a park to help promote Silverton as the "Garden City." Councilor Carter said that she is more  
24 concerned about the gateway coming into town on Highway 214.

25  
26 **III. BOARD COMMUNICATONS**

27  
28 There was no board communications.

29  
30 **IV. ADJOURNMENT**

31  
32 Member Freilinger made a motion to adjourn the meeting and Chairman Palmer adjourned the meeting at  
33 7:32 p.m.

34  
35 Respectfully submitted by:

36  
37  
38 /s/Angela Speier, Assistant to the City Manager/City Clerk

1 CITY OF SILVERTON  
2 **URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY MINUTES**

3 **Silverton Community Center – Council Chambers – 421 South Water St.**

4  
5 **Date: March 4, 2019 at 6:00 p.m.**

6  
7 **I. OPENING CEREMONIES – Call to Order, Pledge of Allegiance & Roll Call**

8  
9 Chairman Palmer called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m.

Present	Absent	
X		Chairman Kyle Palmer
X		Jason Freilinger
X		Laurie Carter
X		Jim Sears
X		Dana Smith
X		Matt Plummer
X		Crystal Neideigh

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27 Staff Present:

28 Agency Director, Christy Wurster; Community Development Director, Jason Gottgetreu; Assistant to the  
29 City Manager/HR Coordinator, Elizabeth Gray; and Assistant to the City Manager/City Clerk, Angela  
30 Speier

31  
32 **II. PUBLIC COMMENT**

33  
34 There was no public comment.

35  
36 **III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

37  
38 Member Freilinger moved to approve the minutes from the meetings held on January 7, 2019 and  
39 February 6, 2019. Member Smith seconded the motion. Member Carter asked that the following  
40 statement be added to the February 6, 2019 minutes: "Mr. O'Day stated that most cities in Oregon give  
41 loans and very few give grants." The members did not recall that statement being made. Staff will review  
42 the recording and bring back the minutes from February 6<sup>th</sup> for approval at a future meeting. The motion  
43 to approve the minutes from January 7, 2019 passed unanimously.

44  
45 **IV. DISCUSSION**

46  
47 **4.1 105 N Water Street Façade Improvement and Building Improvement Grant Request**

48 Community Development Director Jason Gottgetreu explained that before the Urban Renewal Agency  
49 (URA) is a grant application for a façade and building improvement for 105 N Water Street. The building  
50 is owned by Ben Johnston and was constructed in 1961. It is the only non-compatible non-contributing  
51 building within the Silverton Commercial Historic District.

52  
53 Director Gottgetreu explained that the building went through the design review process to get the  
54 approval for the development code standards. One of the conditions is to connect the deck to the  
55 adjacent deck for the creek walk. That condition has been appealed and will be reviewed by the Planning  
56 Commission next week. The next review body would be the Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA).

1  
2 The façade improvement request is to increase the height of the building to 21 feet four inches with a new  
3 parapet wall that is brick façade materials with patterned brick accents and cast stone medallion accents  
4 above a new flat awing. A new cornice will be added. A new door and windows will be installed with a  
5 ceramic tile accent along the foundation. Three bids were received for the façade improvement with the  
6 low bid amounting to \$102,803, making the project eligible for the \$40,000 request.  
7

8 The proposed building improvements are complete structural upgrades to the settling foundation area to  
9 reinforce the main floor and roof structure. A new roof, HVAC system, and creek side deck and railing will  
10 be installed. The grant request is for \$200,000 which requires a \$500,000 match. Three bids were  
11 received with the low bid amounting to \$756,422, making the project eligible for the \$200,000 request.  
12

13 The Urban Renewal Advisory Committee (URAC) recommended the approval of the project with the  
14 contingency that a public access easement is provided. Director Gottgetreu explained that the creek walk  
15 idea is to have connected decks on the backside of buildings along the creek where someone could enter  
16 off the sidewalk near the Main Street Bridge and traverse down to the Le Pooch parking lot. He said that  
17 the URAC recommended the easement be provided not the connection of the decks, which can be looked  
18 at in the future using different urban renewal funds to facilitate that connection. The applicant has  
19 proposed a condition where an easement would be established when the easement to the South is made.  
20 The URAC felt that the cost of any improvements to allow access by connecting the decks should be the  
21 City's responsibility. A lot of the concern is around connecting the two decks physically in terms of the  
22 seismic code and tying two buildings together. The decks would need to be separate, but close enough  
23 that a person could pass between the two. There would need to be modifications to the existing railing to  
24 the south. The applicant has provided the City with easement language which is consistent with the  
25 URAC recommendation.  
26

27 Member Sears asked if the proposed width of the deck is sufficient to provide the walkway area. Director  
28 Gottgetreu said that he believes the design is for an eight foot deck and the easement language is to  
29 provide the minimum ADA width along the western portion of the deck. He said the deck to the south is  
30 ten feet. There is a connection point from the sidewalk to the deck from the south end of the building, but  
31 there isn't an easement on the westerly portion of the deck to the south.  
32

33 Member Smith said that the property to the south originally planned on a five foot deck, but the size  
34 increased in order to accommodate a five foot public easement along the outer edge. She would like to  
35 ensure that the proposed deck is wide enough to accommodate the future connection. She asked about  
36 the other conditions of approval, including bike parking and pedestrian amenities and where those would  
37 be located. Director Gottgetreu explained the pedestrian amenity would have to be provided in front of the  
38 building and the bike parking would need to be within 50 feet of the entrance. There is bike parking  
39 across the street that is sufficient to meet that condition and the code requires some sort of physical  
40 public amenity such as a bench or art.  
41

42 Member Sears asked Director Gottgetreu to expand on the appeal. Director Gottgetreu explained that the  
43 applicant appealed the way the condition was written which they said was too general and vague. The  
44 applicant has since provided an alternative to the condition in the form of easement language.  
45

46 Applicants: Mark Hoyt, Ben Johnston, and Blake Bural. Mr. Hoyt indicated that they toured the building  
47 today and there are significant structural problems in the basement with settling. This is not a structure  
48 that can be easily or economically recaptured without extensive upgrades. This proposal will do those  
49 upgrades to the structure and the façade, as well as improve the deck. The applicants said that they think  
50 there would be enough overlap to accommodate a connection. Mr. Hoyt said that they cannot attach to  
51 the building next door without the owner's consent. Currently, there is not an easement or legal authority  
52 to attach to the building. The recommendation of the URAC was to grant the easement, but that the creek  
53 walk should be publicly funded. He said none of the decks are the same height, thus there will be  
54 significant challenges in connecting the decks. The applicant doesn't feel that the opportunity should be  
55 foreclosed, but the connection should not be added as a requirement to this grant. This request is to  
56 improve the last nonconforming building in downtown Silverton, in which the criteria for both the façade  
57 and building improvement have been met. They have presented a condition that staff can support and  
58 that they will take to the Planning Commission. If the Planning Commission agrees then the easement will

1 be granted, but will be an expense to the City, because it is a public easement granted for the public on  
2 private property.

3  
4 Member Carter said she thinks the creek walk is impractical, unrealistic, unnecessary, an intrusion on  
5 private business and does not think it is a good idea. She asked Mr. Johnston if the grant was not  
6 available would he be able to proceed with the project. Mr. Johnston said that the grant is going to push  
7 the project over the edge to make it happen. She said that she is interested in alternative energy and  
8 asked if he has considered solar panels. He said he would be open to that, but would like to get the initial  
9 project started and work with a future tenant on their energy consumption. Mr. Bural said there is room for  
10 it; the only thing would be analyzing the loading of the roof. Mr. Johnston explained the construction  
11 challenges they are going to be facing throughout this project. They have been through three design  
12 renditions to try and make it pencil out and the grant is needed to help ease the budget shortfall. He said  
13 that it is going to be an amazing project when it is completed and something that he and his kids will be  
14 proud of when it's done.

15  
16 Member Smith said the creek walk has been a vision for a number of residents for a long time and she  
17 feels that the deck needs to be designed in a way to be able to make the connection in the future. She  
18 said that it should be designed wide enough and they should have in mind how to transition the change in  
19 elevation. Discussion ensued on the creek walk concept and how this project is an integral first step in the  
20 process, as well as some of the risks that need to be thought through when making the connection. Mr.  
21 Hoyt stressed that if the URA doesn't approve the grant due to the design of the deck then the project  
22 might not pencil out. Member Smith asked that the applicant build the deck with sufficient depth to make  
23 the connection possible in the future. Mr. Bural explained that currently the deck is five feet, the design  
24 calls for a ten foot deep deck, so he believes that there should be sufficient depth of the deck for a future  
25 connection. He said that the corners align better than what is showed in the materials, but the deck will  
26 not extend as far out as the deck to the south, because the buildings are staggered. Additional surveying  
27 will need to be performed in order to know the difference in elevation.

28  
29 Member Carter said in other communities that have creek walks they are typically concrete pathways that  
30 are built outside of the private property area. Member Smith indicated in Silverton the walkway would be  
31 on private businesses with a public easement. Member Carter said she sees that as an intrusion on  
32 private businesses. She asked about having a path closer towards the foundations at creek level so the  
33 private businesses would not be impacted.

34  
35 Member Freilinger said the proposal in front of them is a compromise that can allow the URA to go into  
36 two different directions down the road after the design and engineering details regarding the creek walk  
37 are further explored. He indicated as long as the deck has sufficient depth to accommodate the possibility  
38 in the future. He does not want to see the URA not take advantage of the opportunity to improve this into  
39 a very desirable building in the downtown.

40  
41 Member Smith made a motion to approve both applications contingent on the width and/or depth and  
42 proximity of the new deck to the existing deck at the property to the south, so that a transition can be  
43 made and that the deck is designed for the dimensions that it takes to do that. The new deck would need  
44 to be sufficient in width and proximity over the creek to accommodate the transition between the decks  
45 and the future five foot easement. Member Sears seconded the motion. Member Sears said that this is  
46 consistent with the applicant's presentation. Member Smith is looking for assurance that the new deck  
47 would accommodate the future connection and that the design is not going to change. The motion passed  
48 unanimously.

#### 49 50 **4.2 405 N Water Street Façade Improvement and Building Improvement Grant Request**

51 Community Development Director Jason Gottgetreu explained this is a grant request for both a façade  
52 and building improvement. 405 N Water Street is the current location for Bazaar Americana, a local retail  
53 business. The proposed façade improvement is to restore a historic bay window in the front of the  
54 building. Three bids were received for the improvements with the low bid being \$21,833 making this  
55 project eligible for up to a \$10,916.50 grant with a \$10,916.50 match.

56  
57 The building improvements are to renovate the interior of the structure by adding a new ADA bathroom  
58 and commercial kitchen. The kitchen equipment would not be considered an eligible expense. He

1 reviewed the bids for the ADA bathrooms, and the eligible portion of the kitchen. He explained that the  
2 total eligible building improvement expenses are \$32,200.50 with a \$32,200.50 match.

3  
4 The URAC recommended the URA approve up to \$10,000 for the façade improvement and approve up to  
5 \$32,500.50 for the building improvements.

6  
7 Applicant: Tom and Darlene O'Connor 3955 Edison Road. Member Sears said on the plans it states  
8 residence and asked if this operates as a residence. Mr. O'Connor said that it is not a residence and that  
9 no one is living in the building. Ms. O'Connor explained that in order to have a residence upstairs it would  
10 need to be retrofitted to include a sprinkler system. She said that they researched the house and  
11 discovered that the bay window used to be there and they are performing renovations that highlight the  
12 history of the house.

13  
14 Member Freilinger made a motion to approve the \$10,000 façade improvement grant and the \$32,200.50  
15 building improvement grant. Councilor Carter seconded the motion. There was no discussion and the  
16 motion passed unanimously.

17  
18 Member Plummer asked if a moratorium could be placed on accepting new applications until after the  
19 URA and URAC meet to discuss changes to the grant and loan criteria. Staff indicated that there are no  
20 applications pending at this time and the date for the joint work session is scheduled for April 15, 2019.  
21 Member Plummer made a motion to place a moratorium on accepting urban renewal grant and loan  
22 applications until after the April 15<sup>th</sup> discussion with the URAC. Member Freilinger seconded the motion.  
23 Member Smith inquired about the timing of the modifications which would likely need to be approved by  
24 resolution at the May URA meeting. Member Plummer amended his motion to change the date to the  
25 URA meeting in May and Member Freilinger was agreeable to that change. Chairman Palmer explained  
26 why he doesn't see this motion as necessary and feels that the City should continue to accept  
27 applications. Director Gottgetreu said that if the URA wishes to review the applications based on the new  
28 guidelines that come out of the April 15<sup>th</sup> meeting, then the application should be tailored to meet the yet  
29 to be determined criteria and program. He wouldn't want to see someone prepare an application based  
30 on the outdated criteria and have to resubmit it. There was no further discussion and the motion passed  
31 unanimously.

32  
33 **V. ADJOURNMENT**


34  
35 Member Freilinger made a motion to adjourn the meeting and Chairman Palmer adjourned the meeting at  
36 7:15 p.m.

37  
38 Respectfully submitted by:

39  
40  
41 /s/Angela Speier, Assistant to the City Manager/City Clerk



**SILVERTON URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY STAFF REPORT  
TO THE HONORABLE BOARD OF DIRECTORS**

	<b>Agenda Item No.:</b>	<b>Topic:</b>
	5.1	Resolution No. 2019-01 – Provide for a Public Hearing; A Resolution to Adopt the Budget for Fiscal Year 2019-2020, make appropriations and declare tax increment
	<b>Agenda Type:</b>	
	Public Hearing	
	<b>Meeting Date:</b>	
June 17, 2019		
<b>Prepared by:</b>	<b>Reviewed by:</b>	<b>Approved by:</b>
Sheena Kroker	Kathleen Zaragoza	Christy S. Wurster

Recommendation:

Following a public hearing staff recommends a motion to approve Resolution No. 2019-01 to adopt the Urban Renewal Agency budget in the amount of \$2,176,977 for fiscal year 2019-2020, make appropriations as shown and declare to levy the maximum amount of tax increment.

Background:

The Budget Committee members have met and approved a budget for the Board’s review and adoption. Public input and delivery of the Budget Message were provided at the May 16, 2019 Urban Renewal Agency Budget Committee meeting. The Budget Committee has approved to request the maximum amount to declare for tax levy and the appropriations for Board’s review.

Budget Impact	Fiscal Year	Funding Source
Adoption	2019-2020	N/A

Attachments:

1. Resolution No. 2019-01

**SILVERTON URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY**  
**RESOLUTION**  
**2019-01**

**A RESOLUTION OF THE SILVERTON URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY BOARD OF DIRECTORS ADOPTING THE FISCAL YEAR 2019-2020 BUDGET, MAKING APPROPRIATIONS, AND DECLARING TAX INCREMENT**

**WHEREAS**, in accordance with Oregon Budget Law, the Silverton Urban Renewal Agency seeks to adopt a budget, appropriate expenditures and declare the tax increment for Fiscal Year 2019-2020.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE SILVERTON URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY, AS FOLLOWS:**

Section 1: The Silverton Urban Renewal Agency hereby adopts the Fiscal Year 2019-2020 budget in the total of \$2,176,977 now on file at the Agency Office, 306 S Water, Silverton, Oregon 97381.

Section 2: That the amounts for fiscal year beginning July 1, 2019 and for the purposes shown below are hereby appropriated:

<u>General Fund</u>	
Materials and Services	\$ 25,345
Capital Outlay	1,752,563
Contingency	<u>399,069</u>
Fund Total	\$ 2,176,977

Section 3: The Board of Directors for the Silverton Urban Renewal Agency hereby resolves to certify to the Marion County Assessor a request for the Silverton Urban Renewal Plan Area for the maximum amount of revenue that may be raised by dividing the taxes under Section 1c, Article IX of the Oregon Constitution and ORS Chapter 457.

Section 4: The Agency Director will file this resolution with the Marion County Clerk and the County Assessor on or before July 15, 2019.

Section 5: That this resolution is and shall be effective after its passage by the Silverton Urban Renewal Agency.

Resolution adopted by the Silverton Urban Renewal Agency of the City of Silverton, this 17th day of June, 2019.

---

Chairman, Urban Renewal Agency  
Kyle Palmer

ATTEST:

---

Urban Renewal Agency Director  
Christy S. Wurster