A RESOLUTION FOR THE ADOPTION OF ENGINEERING AND FINANCE REPORTS, AJTHORIZATION TO SECURE EASEMENTS, TO OBTAIN BIDS, TO INCREASE APPROPRIATIONS, AND TO ISSUE WARRANTS FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF ST-85-1, Salem Avenue, Sherman Street to Geary Street.

BE IT RESOLVED that the engineering reports of the Public Works Director and the finance reports of the Finance Director filed with the City Recorder on the 22nd day of October, 1986, concerning Salem Avenue, Sherman Street to Geary Street be and the same are hereby adopted.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Council authorize the Mayor and City Recorder to sign agreements on behalf of the City of Albany for the purpose of obtaining easements to construct the said improvements, direct the City Manager to obtain bids for the construction of said projects as required by law, and authorize the Mayor and City Recorder to make, issue, and negotiate General Obligation Improvement Warrants for the performance of said improvements, bearing interest not to exceed $12 \%$ per annum, and constituting general obligations of the City of Albany. The terms of conditions of such warrants shall be as provided by ORS 287.502 to 287.510.

DATED this 22nd day of October, 1986.


T0: Albany City Council
VIA: Albany Public Works Committee
FROM: Mark A. Yeager, P.E., Engineering/Utilities Division Manager
DATE: October 8, 1986, for October 8, 1986 City Council Meeting
SUBJECT: ST-85-1, Salem Avenue, Sherman St. to Geary St.

The Engineer's Report for ST-85-1, Salem Avenue was reviewed by the Albany Public Works Committee on October 7, 1986. The Committee agreed with the recommended method of assessing the benefiting properties for a portion of the project cost.

It is recommended that the City Council accept the Engineer's Report, set a public hearing date, and direct the City Recorder to notify the affected property owners of the public hearing.

Adoption of the Engineer's Report and the Financial Investigation Report will follow the public hearing.

Respectfully submitted,

## Mark A. Yeager op.

 Engineering/Utilities Division ManagerApproved by,


T0: Albany City Council<br>VIA: Bill Barrons, City Manager<br>FROM: John Joyce, P.E., Public Works Director<br>DATE: October 7, 1986 for October 8, 1986 City Council Meeting<br>SUBJECT: Engineer's Report for ST-85-1, Salem Avenue, Sherman St. to Geary St.

## Description of Project

On January 22, 1986 the Albany Clty Council adopted Resolution No. 2599 stating its intent to improve Salem Avenue from Sherman Street to Geary Street. Resolution No. 2599 also authorized the City to enter into an agreement with the State of Oregon to use Federal Aid Urban (FAU) funds to finance a portion of the project cost. The City received notification on March 18, 1986 that FAU funding for the project had been approved by the Federal Highway Administration. The preliminary construction plans have been completed by the City and reviewed by the State. The project will include construction of approximately 1950 lineal feet of 36'$44^{\prime}$ wide street with curb and gutter, sidewalk and storm drains. Construction will include widening the Periwinkle Creek bridge to accommodate sidewalk on the south side. Sidewalk on the north side is existing.

The estimated cost of the project is $\$ 595,000$. Total FAU money available is $\$ 455,000$. Under the terms of the FAU program, the State contributes a share of the project cost equal to $9 \%$ of the available Federal funds - a total of $\$ 41,000$. The City must also pay $9 \%$ ( $\$ 41,000$ ) plus the balance of the project cost $(59,000)$ for a total of $\$ 100,000$.

There are three sources of funds to pay the City's share of the cost of the project:

1) Linn County - The right-of-way for Salem Avenue was originally deeded to the county and they are responsible for maintenance of the existing improvements. It is proposed that the County transfer the right-of-way to the City of Albany and that the City accept the road for maintenance. At the time the right-of-way is transferred, Linn County will contribute a portion of the cost of improving the street to city standards. Their current policy is to contribute an amount equal to the cost of a $1 / 2^{\prime \prime}$ asphalt overlay of the existing street surface. This amount is estimated to be $\$ 10,000$.
2) Sewer Separation Fund - The Salem Avenue project includes construction of a storm drain pipe to Periwinkle Creek that will make it possible to drain eight

## Engineer's Report

 ST-85-1, Salem Avenueexisting catch basins that are now connected to the sanitary sewer. It is recommended that an amount equal to the cost that would have been incurred to separate these catch basins with the North Periwinkle sewer separation project be contributed to pay a portion of the cost of the Salem Avenue project. This amount is estimated to be $\$ 42,000$.
3) Property Owner Assessments - After FAU, State, and County contributions, $\$ 47,000$ of the project cost remains to be funded. It is recommended that this cost be paid by the benefitting property owners.

## Summary of Estimated Costs

A. Estimated Construction Cost $\$ 496,000$
B. 20\% Engineering, Legal and Administrative $\quad+99,000$
(15\% City, 5\% State)
C. Total.Cost $\$ 595,000$

## Project Funding

| A. FAU Fund Contribution | $\$ 455,000$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| B. State Contribution | 41,000 |
| C. Linn County Contribution | 10,000 |
| D. Sewer Separation Fund | $\mathbf{4 2 , 0 0 0}$ |
| E. Total Available Funding | 548,000 |
| F. Balance To Be Paid By Property Owners | $\$ 47,000$ |

## Method of Assessment

It is recommended that the cost of this project remaining after FAU, State, County and Sewer Separation contributions be assessed to the benefitting properties on a lineal foot basis:
$\$ 47,000 \% 3195$ assessable front feet $=\$ 14.71 /$ front foot
Because of required FAU and State procedures, accounting of all project costs may not be received by the City for a considerable length of time after final payment to the construction contractor. (The City's most recent experience was two years for the Waverly Drive FAU project.) If the City waits to assess the project until the final accounting is received the assessment procedure becomes more
complicated. Communication with property owners is interrupted, owners of properties may change, etc. Therefore, it is recommended that the property owners be assessed at the time the final payment is made to the contractor.

Additionally, if the project exceeds the estimated cost, it is recommended that the cost to the property owners be limited to $\$ 15 /$ front foot. The balance of the project cost would be paid from the Street Maintenance Fund. If the construction cost is significantly less than estimated, it is recommended that the property owners be assessed at the minimum rate of $\$ 10.00 /$ front foot and the contribution from the Sewer Separation Fund be reduced to balance the total expenditures.

Assessment Data
See attached Property and Estimated Assessment Data sheet.

Respectfully submitted,

| Mark A. Yeager, |
| :--- |
| $\begin{array}{l}\text { Engineering/Utilities Division Manager }\end{array}$ |

Approved by,


Public Works IIFrector


|  |  | $I$ |  | $j$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ST-85-1, Salem Avenue, Sherman to Geary |  |  |  |  |
| No. | OWNER/ADDRESS | DESCRIPTION \& TAX LOT | FRONT FT. | TOTAL ESTIMATED ASSESSMENT |
| 8. | Elaine Weinberg <br> 1317 Salem Avenue, SE Albany, OR 97321 | 11-3W-5CC, TL 1300 | 66.18 | \$ 973.51 |
| 9. | United Pentecostal Church 230 Pine St., SE <br> Albany, OR 97321 | 11-3W-5CC, TL 1500 | 66.18 | 973.51 |
| 10. | United Pentecostal Church 230 Pine St., SE <br> Albany, OR 97321 | 11-3W-5CC, TL 1700 | 66.18 | 973.51 |
| 11. | Lawrence \& Dorothy Hobart c/o Edward Carney <br> P. O. Box 68186 <br> Oak Grove, OR 97268 | 11-3W-5CC, TL 2500 | 45.10 | 663.42 |
| 12. | Arthur \& Orba Fintel 1320 Salem Ave., SE Albany, OR 97321 | 11-3W-5CC, TL 2400 | 135.30 | 1,990.26 |
| 13. | Joe \& Norma McPherson <br> c/o Claude Oulman, K-D Properties Co. <br> P. O. Box 516 <br> Albany, OR 97321 | 11-3W-5CC, TL 4500 | 334.64 | 4,922.55 |
| 14. | Mervin \& Gladys Dickerson c/o Opal \& Eulus Ballard 1542 Salem Ave., SE Albany, OR 97321 | 11-3W-5CC, TL 8600 | 157.62 | 2,318.59 |
| 15. | Marie Patton 1529 Salem Ave., SE A1bany, OR 97321 | 11-3W-5CC, IL 8700 | 52.54 | 772.86 |

## ST-85-1, Salem Avenue, Sherman to Geary

| No. | OWNER/ADDRESS | DESCRIPTION \& TAX LOT | FRONT FT. | TOTAL ESTIMATED <br> ASSESSMENT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 16. | Oregon Education Association 6900 SW. Hainer Rd. <br> Tigard, OR 97223 | 11-3W-5CC, TL 1800 | 90.20 | \$ 1,326.84 |
| 17. | Burlington Northern Inc. 1101 NW Hoyt Portland, OR 97209 | 11-3W-5CC, TL 4300 | 309.36 | 4,550.69 |
| 18. | John \& Lesley North c/o 0.F. Wale <br> 1530 Salem Ave., SE Albany, OR 97321 | 11-3W-5CC, TL 4400 | 165.71 | 2,437.59 |
| 19. | Lois Hiatt 1925 Old Salem Rd., NE Albany, OR 97321 | 11-3W-5CC, TL 9600 | 45.00 | 661.95 |
| 20. | Miriam Lent <br> 1539 Salem Ave., SE <br> Albany, OR 97321 | 11-3W-5CC, TL 9500 | 50.00 | 735.50 |
| 21. | John \& Christina Brown 37185 Robinson Dr. Scio, OR 97374 | 11-3W-5CC, TL 8800 | 44.40 | 653.12 |
| 22. | Miriam Lent 1539 Salem Ave., SE Albany, OR 97321 | 11-3W-5CC, TL 9000 | 73.81 | 1,085.75 |
| 23. | George \& Doris Capwell <br> P. O. Box 7445 <br> Salem, OR 97302 | 11-3W-5CC, TL 9100 | 39.40 | 579.57 |




LCAL IPPROVEEN DISTRCT NO. ST-85-1
Salem Ave., Sherman St. to Geary Street

| Onner | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \begin{array}{l} \text { Property } \\ \text { Description } \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% of } \\ & \text { Project } \end{aligned}$ | Estimated Assessment | Maximum Allowable Bancroft | True Cash value As of |  |  |  | Total Other Assessments on this Property | Percent Assessments to T.C.Y. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Semi-anmal } \\ & \text { Pmit. } 10 \text { Year } \\ & \text { Bancroft } \end{aligned}$ | Attitude Townerd Project |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Land | $\begin{aligned} & \text { limpover } \\ & \text { ments } \end{aligned}$ | Total |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { In } \\ & \text { Eavor } \end{aligned}$ | Against |  |
| Mr\&Mrs Harris Tunison | $\begin{aligned} & 11 \div 3 \mathrm{~W}-6 \mathrm{DD}, \\ & \mathrm{TL} 9400 \end{aligned}$ | 2 | 973.51 | 22,500 | 11,250 |  | 11,250 |  | - | 9\% | 93.00 |  |  |  |
| Mazzocco | $\begin{aligned} & 11-3 W-6 D D, \\ & \text { TL } 9500 \end{aligned}$ | 2 | 973.51 | 19,620 | 9,810 |  | 9,810 |  | - | 10\% | 93.00 |  |  |  |
| Mazzocco | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11-3W-6DD, } \\ & \text { TL. } 9600 \end{aligned}$ | 4 | 1,947.02 | 540,180 | 40,140 | 229,95p | 270, |  | - | 1\% | 185.00 |  |  |  |
| Bird c/o Carney | $\begin{aligned} & 11-3 \mathrm{~W}-6 \mathrm{DD}, \\ & \text { TL. } 9800 \end{aligned}$ | 3 | 1,616.48 | 66,240 | 24,480 | 8,640 | O 33, |  | - | 5\% | 154.00 |  |  |  |
| Bird | $\begin{aligned} & 11-3 \mathrm{~W}-6 \mathrm{DD}, \\ & \text { TL } 9700 \end{aligned}$ | 7 | 3,721.63 | . 237,600 | 58,320 | 60,480 | O 118, |  | - | 3\% | 354.00 |  |  |  |
| Gaskill | $\begin{aligned} & 11-3 \mathrm{~W}-5 \mathrm{CC}, \\ & \text { TL. } 1100 \end{aligned}$ | 2 | - $\quad 722.70$ | 41,320 | 6,240 | 14,420 |  |  |  | 3\% | 69.00 |  |  |  |
| Gaskill | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l} 11-3 \mathrm{~W}-5 \mathrm{CC}, \\ \text { TL } 1000 \end{array}$ | 1 | 250.07 | 12,480 | 6,240 |  |  |  |  | 4\% | 24.00 |  |  |  |
| Weinberg | $\begin{array}{\|l} 11-3 \mathrm{~W}-5 \mathrm{CC}, \\ \mathrm{TL} 1300 \end{array}$ | 2 | 973.51 | 50,660 | 9,600 | 15,730 | $30 \text {, }$ |  |  | 4\% | $93.0 ¢$ |  |  |  |
| Un. Pentecost al Church | $\begin{array}{l\|l} 11-3 \mathrm{~W}-5 \mathrm{CC}, \\ \text { TL } 1500 \end{array}$ | 2 | 973.51 | 56,500 | 9,600 | 18,650 |  |  |  | 3\% | 93.00 |  |  |  |

Un. Pentecostal 11-3W-5CC,
$973.51241,00010,500110,000$ 120,500
zhurch TL 1700

2ction 1:
FIMNCINL IMESTIGATION REDRT LOCAL DPPPVEVEN DISTRCT NO. $\qquad$

| Omer | PropertyDescription | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% of } \\ & \text { Project } \end{aligned}$ | Estimated | Maxtmum Allowable Bancroft | True Cash Value As of |  |  | Total Other Assessments on this Property | Percent Assessments to T.C.V. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Semi-annual } \\ & \text { Pmt. } 10 \text { Year } \\ & \text { Bancroft } \end{aligned}$ | Attitude Toward Project |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Land | $\begin{aligned} & \begin{array}{l} \text { Improve } \\ \text { ments } \end{array} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Total |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { In } \\ & \text { Eavor } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | ngainst | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Ibn } \\ & \text { Comitted } \end{aligned}$ |
| Corney | $\begin{aligned} & 11-3 W-5 C C, \\ & \text { TL } 2500 \end{aligned}$ | 2 | 663.42 | 18,240 | 9,120 |  | 9,120 |  | 7\% | 63.00 |  |  |  |
| Fintel | $\begin{aligned} & 11-3 W-5 C C, \\ & \text { TL } 2400 \end{aligned}$ | 4 | 1,990.26 | 98,280 | 17,280 | 31,86¢ | 49,140 |  | 4\% | 189.00 |  |  |  |
| Oulman | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11-3W-5CC, } \\ & \text { TL } 4500 \end{aligned}$ | 11 | 4,922.59 | 460,080 | 31,180 | 448,860 | 230,040 | - | 2\% | 468.00 |  |  |  |
| Ballard | $\begin{aligned} & 11-3 W-5 C C, \\ & \text { TL } 8600 \end{aligned}$ | 5 | 2,318.59 | 117,540 | 26,190 | 32,58 | 58,770 | - | 4\% | 220.00 |  |  |  |
| Patton | $\begin{aligned} & 11-3 W-5 C C, \\ & \text { TL } 8700 \end{aligned}$ | 2 | $722.8 \$$ | 51,480 | 9,600 | 16,140 | 25,740 |  | 3\% | 69.00 |  |  |  |
| Jehova's <br> -Witness | $\begin{aligned} & 11-3 W-5 C C, \\ & \text { TL } 1800 \end{aligned}$ | 3 | 1,326.84 | 144,000 | 12,000 | 60,000 | 72,000 |  | 2\% | 126.00 |  |  |  |
| Burlington Northern Inc. | $\begin{aligned} & 11-3 \mathrm{~W}-5 \mathrm{CC}, \\ & \text { TL } 4300 \end{aligned}$ | 10 | 4,550.69 | 111,600 | 55,800 |  | 55,80 |  | 8\% | 432.00 |  |  |  |
| North \& Wale | $\begin{aligned} & 11-3 W-5 C C, \\ & \text { TL } 4400 \end{aligned}$ | 5 | 2,437.59 | 116,880 | 19,200 | 39,240 | 58,440 |  | 4\% | $232.0 ¢$ |  |  |  |
| Hiatt | $\begin{aligned} & 11-3 W-5 C C, \\ & \text { TL } 9600 \end{aligned}$ | 2 | 661.95 | 45,360 | 10,080 | 12,600 | $22,6 \$ 0$ |  | 3\% | 63.00 |  |  |  |



## Section 2.

Attach map showing vacant lots and undeveloped property.
If LID is a new subdivision - attach map identifying vacant lots and undeveloped property.

## Section 3.

Number of similar lots and property held by the City through foreclosure. This proposed LID contains 30 tax lots of which 27 are improved. The City has no lots with improvements that were obtained through foreclosure.

Section 4.
Delinquency rate of assessments and taxes in the area.
The City has no additional assessments on property included in this LID.

## Section 5.

Real estate value trends in the area.
Property located within this LID is a near equal-mix of commercial and residential. Value trends have been consistent with other areas of the City. The Linn County Assessor decreased the value on residential property in 1985 by $8 \%$.

## Section 6.

Tax levy trends and potential financial impact on Improvement District.
Two possible situations: one, if any tax limitation measure or sales tax measure passes in the November election, then property taxes could be reduced by $40 \%$; or two, if no 1 imitation measure passes taxes should remain approximately the same. Tax rates have increased slightly, but property values have also decreased which would be an offsetting factor.

Section 7.
Does the project conform to the City Comprehensive Plan?
If no, explain:
Yes.

## Section 8.

Status of City's debt.
The City has $\$ 3,905,000$ in outstanding Bancroft debt. Statutory limitation for the City is $\$ 19,500,000$. Approximately $\$ 1,200,000$ in foreclosed property is held by the City.

Note: Proposed legislation could limit the City's ability to issue additional Bancroft bonds without specific voter approval.

## Section 9.

Estimated cost of financing.
Cost of Bancroft debt on a 10 -year issue is approximately $7 \%$. Cost to the benefitted property owner would be approximately $9 \%$.

Section 10.
General credit worthiness of property owners within the LID.
Out of the 30 properties that are included in this LID, only three do not have improvements. The average percent assessment to true cash value is $4 \%$.

1) 16 properties will have an annual assessment of less than $\$ 200$.
2) An additional six properties will have an assessment lesŝ than $\$ 400$ per year.
3) There are three properties with a projected assessment of nearly $\$ 1,000$ per year - all of these properties are zoned commercial.

The proposed assessment on these properties should not be a hardship to the property owners.

