



**City Council Meeting Agenda
Tuesday, February 25, 2025
5:30 p.m. – Work Session Meeting
7:00 p.m. – City Council Regular Meeting**

Welcome! The public is strongly encouraged to participate remotely but there is seating at Civic Hall for those who are not able to participate remotely. However, if you are not feeling well, please stay home and take care of yourself.

The public is strongly encouraged to relay concerns and comments to the Council in one of four ways:

- *Attend in person and fill out a public comment card*
- *Email at any time up to **noon on Monday, February 24th** to CityRecorderTeam@mcminnvilleoregon.gov*
- *If appearing via telephone or ZOOM, please sign up prior by **noon on Monday, February 24th** by emailing the City Recorder at CityRecorderTeam@mcminnvilleoregon.gov as the chat function is not available when calling in Zoom; **You will need to provide the City Recorder with your First and Last name, Address, and contact information (email or phone) for a public comment card.***

*You can live broadcast the City Council Meeting on cable channels Xfinity 11 and 331,
Frontier 29 or webstream here:*

mcm11.org/live

CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION & CITY COUNCIL REGULAR MEETING:

You may join online via Zoom Webinar Meeting:

<https://mcminnvilleoregon.zoom.us/j/81775630535?pwd=Bwi6ooPBcnvloqI3WTz8Dkq2qOhZiD.1>

Or you can call in and listen via Zoom: 1-253- 215- 8782

Webinar ID: 817 7563 0535

5:30 PM – WORK SESSION MEETING – VIA ZOOM AND SEATING AT CIVIC HALL

1. CALL TO ORDER
2. CULTURE, PARKS AND RECREATION PROJECT
3. ADJOURNMENT OF WORK SESSION

7:00 PM – REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING – VIA ZOOM AND SEATING AT CIVIC HALL

1. CALL TO ORDER & ROLL CALL
2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
3. INVITATION TO COMMUNITY MEMBERS FOR PUBLIC COMMENT –
The Mayor will announce that any interested audience members are invited to provide comments. Anyone may speak on any topic other than: a matter in litigation, a quasi-judicial land use matter; or a matter scheduled for public hearing at some future date. The Mayor may limit comments to 4 minutes per person for a total of 32 minutes. The Mayor will read comments emailed to City Recorded and then call on anyone who has signed up to provide public comment.
4. ADVICE/ INFORMATION ITEMS
 - a. Reports from Councilors on Committee & Board Assignments
 - b. Department Head Reports

5. CONSENT AGENDA

- a. Consider the request from Copious Cellars, LLC for Wholesale, OLCC Liquor License located at 1421 NE Alpha Drive.

6. ADJOURNMENT OF REGULAR MEETING



City of McMinnville

City of McMinnville
Parks and Recreation Department

Contact: Susan Muir
McMinnville, OR 97128
(503) 434-7310

www.mcminnvilleoregon.gov

STAFF REPORT

DATE: February 25, 2025
TO: Mayor and City Council
FROM: Jeff Towery, City Manager and Susan Muir, Parks and Recreation Director
SUBJECT: Culture, Parks and Recreation Project – Follow up from January 28, 2025 work session

Report in Brief:

On January 25, 2025 City Council shared their impressions on the first 5 a series of 11 questions related to the Culture, Parks and Recreation Project. Before City Council picks up with the remaining 6 questions, there were several themes that emerged from the discussion in January, that if answered, might help address some of the bigger picture questions that are connected to the remaining questions.

The January work session conversation was helpful and informative, and staff will provide council and the public responses and details at the February 25th work session. Some information is also provided in the attachment.

Anyone wanting more background can find information here:

1. [The phase I feasibility report](#), and
2. [The MacPAC concept plan](#).

Background:

Staff categorized the comments made at the work session on January 25 into the following themes:

1. Financial
2. Partners

3. Location
4. Phasing

Summary of the issues:

1. Financial: Several of the questions that came up related to financial issues, in particular about city debt and issuing bonds, will be addressed at a separate work session currently scheduled for April 8, 2025. That work session will include the City's Finance Director, the City's Municipal Advisor and the City's Bond Counsel to address:

- Timing of and information about the City's existing debt
- How the timing and phasing of issuing bonds works
- How the bond issuance timing and amount translates to annual property taxes assessed
- Overview of current property taxes for McMinnville taxpayers

Other financial issues that came up that will be discussed on February 25th (and are addressed in Attachment A) include:

- a. Providing the cost estimates and decision making history regarding building new or rehabilitating the existing structures.
- b. How did we get here related to not maintaining our existing buildings and parks?
- c. Proposed fee structures including 'in city' discounts/out of city fees, policy setting for subsidies.
- d. Creative revenue options
- e. Cost to put an issue on the ballot
- f. Overall questions about costs referenced related to park construction and park maintenance.

2. Partners:

- a. What have the partnership conversations been to date?
- b. Have we considered Linfield as a partner?

3. Location:

- a. Overall background on MacPAC's process to find, analyze and select preferred site(s).
- b. Upper City Park discussion

4. Phasing:

- a. Is there a background and recommendation for scaling the facilities?
- b. Scaling buildings, scaling finances v. phasing buildings, phasing finances

Discussion:

Several of these issues are addressed in the attachment, and staff will also discuss them during the presentation on February 25th.

Attachments:

A: Initial staff responses to issues around finances, partners, location and phasing.

Fiscal Impact:

Over the last 6 years, the City has spent approximately \$360,624 on the phase I feasibility study, the MacPAC report, polling and communications.

Recommendation:

Staff recommends the council review the materials and come to the discussion with more questions for staff to address as needed. This is an information item, no action is requested.

Next Steps

A financial/bonding work session is scheduled for April 8, 2025.

Attachment A

1. **Financial:** Several of the questions that came up related to financial issues, in particular debt and issuing bonds, will be addressed at a separate work session currently scheduled for **April 8, 2025**. That work session will include the City’s Finance Director, the City’s Municipal Advisor and the City’s Bond Counsel to provide information about:
 - Timing of and information about the City’s existing debt
 - How the timing and phasing of issuing bonds works
 - How the bond issuance timing and amount translates to annual property taxes assessed
 - Overview of current property taxes for McMinnville taxpayers

Other financial issues that came up that will be discussed on February 25th include:

a. Provide the cost estimates and decision making history regarding building new or rehabilitating the existing structures.

Response:

Note: City staff emailed similar information to City Council on 2.13.25.

The cost points below are from the Phase I feasibility study and show what it would cost to renovate the existing buildings, and what it would cost to build the same facilities we have now, but new. This was not a plan for expansion or additions, but merely a data point to see the difference in costs of building new, or renovating. Keep in mind, these estimates are now almost 5 years old, but still give an estimate of the differentials that were considered.

Community Center			
	Cost Range	Construction Cost Range	Total Project Cost Range
Renovation Cost	\$450-\$500/SF	\$24,750,000-\$27,500,000	\$32,175,000 - \$35,750,000
New Construction	\$500-\$550/SF	\$27,500,000 - \$30,250,000	\$35,750,000-\$39,325,000

Note: Estimates were based on 2019 pricing and include all expected costs. The figures are conservative based on a general estimate and without the benefit of a site, concept plan, or determination of building systems.

Aquatic Center			
	Cost Range	Construction Cost Range	Total Project Cost Range
Renovation Cost	\$550-660/SF	\$15,400,000-16,800,000	\$20,020,000-\$21,840,000
New Construction	\$700-750/SF	\$19,600,000-21,000,000	\$25,480,000-\$27,300,000

Note: Estimates were based on 2019 pricing and include all expected costs. The figures are conservative based on a general estimate and without the benefit of a site, concept plan, or determination of building systems.

In addition to the financials, the recommendations from the architect were:

For the Community Center:

Due to the extensive renovation, compromises to an operationally functional layout, and challenges to modifying the existing structure, it is recommended that building a new Community Center is the most cost effective and responsible investment of public resources vs. the alternative of renovating the existing facility which would ultimately result in a compromised Community Center facility.

For the Aquatic Center:

Due to the poor condition of the building’s exterior, extensive renovation and expansion required within the constrained site footprint, limited parking, and compromised functionality, it is recommended that building a new Aquatic Center is the most cost effective and responsible investment of public resources vs. the alternative of renovating the existing facility which would ultimately result in a compromised Aquatic Center facility. If collocated with a new Community Center the Aquatic Center would share a cardio/weight fitness center and reduce the front desk staffing resulting in enhanced operational efficiencies and cost recovery.

On July 17, 2019 when the Phase 1 feasibility study was presented to City Council, they were provided with 3 options to consider;

- (1) Status quo – existing facilities are improved but remain, recreation programming stays the same.
- (2) New/Old – Community and Aquatic Center are combined into one new building, recreation programming and amenities are increased.
- (3) All New – All 3 parks and recreation facilities are combined into one new building and programming and amenities are increased.

The 5 councilors in attendance showed support to move forward with option #2. To see the pros/cons of the 3 different options, see slides 30, 31, 32 at this link: https://www.mcminvilleoregon.gov/sites/default/files/fileattachments/city_council/meeting/12511/mcminville_presentation_7-17-19_revised7-12.pdf

This was also the meeting where the City Council thought to bring the library into the project.

b. How did we get here related to not maintaining our existing buildings and parks?

Needed cuts to balance the city's budget show up in the facility maintenance sections of the P&R budget in the City Council approved FY 12/13 budget. The Aquatic Center's repairs and maintenance line item was reduced by almost 30%, the Community Center repairs and maintenance budget was reduced by 25%. The first policy decision by City Council appears to have been made through the same budget. In the P&R section of the budget, the following background was provided:

"Due to the City's current budget challenge, less preventative maintenance is planned; major unanticipated repairs will be covered through General Fund operational contingencies if needed."

In other words, the City at that point pivoted to the 'run to fail' model of waiting and using contingency (emergency) city funds to fix what breaks at the AC & CC. Over the following years, the city's budget situation did not improve, and maintenance needs were not funded.

City Council approved needed cuts to the Parks Maintenance budget the following year in the FY 13/14 budget. In that budget, staff noted that the required cuts to the Parks Maintenance budget would result in a reduction to general park upkeep (litter removal, restroom cleaning, general upkeep and vandalism reporting and repair)

by 25% in community parks and in our neighborhood and linear parks the reduction was 40–50%. The decision to close some park restrooms in the winter due to lack of resources to maintain them was also made. Irrigation systems were shut down to reduce the costs to mow, knowing that these areas would go brown during the summer. Mulching park landscape beds was reduced or eliminated, fall annual planting programs for annual flowers were eliminated, and trail system maintenance was also reduced. And, cleaning cycles for play equipment was extended from occurring every year, to occurring every other year.

To remedy the situation with deferred parks maintenance, staff has proposed a ‘build back’ of parks maintenance over 3 years, but only the first year was approved 2 years ago and the rest remain unfunded. In addition, the updated Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan council adopted in June, 2024 contains the required resources and operating plans to avoid a backslide into deferred maintenance.

The proposed operating budget for the new recreation center also provides a funding plan to adequately fund capital replacement and facility maintenance to avoid the same backslide in the proposed new building.

c. Proposed fee structures including ‘in city’ discounts/out of city fees, policy setting for subsidies:

From the 11.12.24 city council work session. See slide 43

here: https://www.mcminnvilleoregon.gov/sites/default/files/fileattachments/city_council/meeting/25564/final_operating_cost_ppt_11.12.pdf

The operating budget prepared for this project did a market comparison of surrounding facilities, and the proposed family membership rate for the new building is in alignment than many of our nearby recreation providers.

It’s important to note, City Council will set the fees and rates (at a later phase of the project). If Council decides to reduce a fee, such as for facility rentals (mentioned at the meeting as potentially pricing people out), staff can adjust the dials to show where fees would need to go up, to allow others to go down. City Council is in control of the dials related to fees in the new building.

Market Comparison – Quick Scan

Category	Daily		10 Visit (+1 Free)		Annual Pass		Month
	Res	NonRes	Res	NonRes	Res	NonRes	
Adults	\$8.50	\$10.50	\$85	\$105	\$690	\$865	\$55.5
Youth (3-17)	\$7.00	\$8.50	\$70	\$85	\$530	\$665	\$42.0
Senior (60+)	\$7.00	\$8.50	\$70	\$85	\$530	\$665	\$42.0
Family	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$1,200	\$1,500	\$98.0

Location	Annual family membership rate (current)	Escalated to 2028
Kroc Center Salem	\$1,620	\$1,895
Sherwood YMCA	\$1,443	\$1,668
Juniper (Bend)	\$1,152	\$1,348
McMinnville Rec Center	N/A	\$1,200
Chehalem Aquatic / Rec Center	\$999	\$1,169
Woodburn	\$890	\$1,041
Shute (Hillsboro)	\$547	\$640

Another example on slide 41, escalating our current month to month single adult rate of the CC and AC to 2028, the fees we’re proposing are only an increase of 11%, from \$49.72 to 55.50.

To help equalize the fact that city residents will be paying for the capital bond through their property taxes, while people living outside the city don’t, in the proposed operating budget presented to City Council in November, staff suggested that people who live in McMinnville get a 25% discount over non-residents. Staff at Parks and Recreation facilities currently have access to look up whether or not an address is in the city or not, and do it often.

City Council will have the opportunity to decide whether or not 25% is the right reduction for residents when the fees are adopted prior to opening the new building.

d. Did we look at all of the revenue options, and include creative options?

There are other options that could potentially bring in revenue, one example is to sell naming rights to a building, an amenity, etc. This has worked well for one Oregon city, Medford has been very successful in that regard. They are unique in

how successful it has been, likely due to a number of factors, including their community size, location and number of businesses (population of Medford is more than twice that of McMinnville and does not have surrounding cities of similar or larger size).

Staff did not use what could be considered riskier or non-traditional revenue in building the proposed operating budget for the rec center, but rather we were conservative in trying to estimate realistically what we could be looking at for expenses and revenues. There is room for those opportunities in any case, and if the city is fortunate to bring in some of the revenue opportunities outside of the proposed operating budget, those additional funds could be used to buy down other operating costs (or subsidize user fees, or pay down the bonds, etc.) once the opportunities have been identified and quantified.

Staff does not recommend including one-off or untested potential revenue sources at this point in time, however City Council could request staff to do so. The risk is too great to assume revenue prior to testing it, and could leave future generations of administrators and policy makers without a stable source of revenue.

e. What is the cost to put this on the ballot?

This is being researched.

f. The construction costs and maintenance estimates for parks seems high.

The estimated numbers for park construction costs in the 5 year action plan in the PROS Plan adopted by City Council are considered planning level, which is typical. They will need to be updated regularly and are not escalated beyond 2023. They were calculated using actual, regional information regarding construction costs for public parks. They may seem high but are well within market. In addition to those estimates, several policies were included in the plan to support being good stewards of public money, including reevaluating costs regularly and adjusting as necessary, and perhaps most important is the policy to apply best practices in sustainable maintenance and operations.

To estimate the maintenance costs, staff surveyed eight similar parks maintenance operations in Oregon in 2021. The consultant team used those numbers for the maintenance estimates found in the PROS plan.

(As a point of reference, the Jay Pearson Neighborhood Park which opened in 2019, cost approximately \$1.6 million to construct.)

2. Partners:

a. What have the partnership conversations been to date?

Project Partners have been a part of this project since phase I, you can see who was considered early in the process on P. 67 [here](#):

City staff has met with most of these identified partners (and many others) and most importantly let organizations know we are open to and ready to partner. While only 16 partners were identified in phase I, the city through parks and recreation and the library, partners with many organizations that aren't listed in the phase I report. Staff continues to nurture and formalize those partnerships, as recommended in the phase I report, by such actions as entering into memorandums of understanding (MOU) to formalize relationships (Linfield, Mac W&L, the Friends of the Senior Center).

b. Have we considered Linfield as a partner?

In March 2021, the City of McMinnville and Linfield University entered into a memorandum of understanding regarding partnering on a location for the proposed rec center. Approximately 6 months later, at the August 5, 2021 MacPAC meeting, Mary Anne Rodriguez, representing Linfield told MacPAC the MOU that Linfield had with the city was set to expire on September 5. The University notified MacPAC they would not be renewing that MOU but rather focusing on a new strategic plan for their campuses. Linfield also had a representative who participated in MacPAC. Linfield's strategic plan was then completed with a goal of diversifying revenue opportunities, including through real estate holdings. The university has now moved through many conversations about master planning their undeveloped property in that vein. The city has been involved in those conversations and understandably, selling 10 acres to the city does not appear to be one of the preferred options to achieve the ongoing revenue goals of their strategic plan.

Still, the city remains open to Linfield University as a valued partner on facilities and other community issues.

3. Location:

a. Overall background on MacPAC's process to find, analyze and select preferred site(s).

Prior to analyzing any locations, MacPAC adopted site evaluation criteria to use as a framework for the analysis. Those criteria included financial stewardship, access, economic viability, potential for expansion, and others.

Site selection for the Rec Center was an integral part of the planning process. This included evaluating sites 10 acres or larger currently in McMinnville or within the Urban Growth Boundary. After the preliminary evaluation of 13 sites, the list was narrowed down to two, including Linfield University owned property in the southern part of town and Wortman Park to the northeast. Those two sites were evaluated with more detail and compared against each other with a rating system that resulted in MacPAC's recommendation of the Linfield University owned site. It was determined the Wortman Park site had challenging procedural barriers and would remove park land from the City's already limited inventory. Subsequently, the MacPAC analyzed another industrially zoned property owned by MacW&L (aka the Miller Property) as a comparable site to the Linfield University site. The MacPAC recommended that both the Linfield University Property and Miller property.

Once the Linfield property was no longer under consideration due to the non-renewal of the MOU by Linfield, the Miller Property became the preferred location that the city pursued. A memorandum of understanding was entered into with MW&L and that then led to the drafting of a purchase and sale agreement. City Council authorized the City Manager to enter into the purchase and sale agreement for the Miller Property on December 10, 2024 through resolution 2024-69.

While not every neighborhood is within walking distance, the proposed site aligns with Joe Dancer Park, a familiar and much-used recreation hub. Any given Saturday in spring or fall almost 800 families and friends gather for the recreation sports played at the park. Transportation options are expanding, and MacPAC's site selection criteria evaluated accessibility alongside many other key factors.

b. What was the discussion regarding potentially expanding at the current location of the Aquatic Center?

This option came up during the phase I feasibility study public meeting at City Council when a member of the public asked the architect what they thought of this idea. The project architect responded that the area is already too small for the existing uses, and any expansion to the facilities would not be able to be accommodated.

The area from the middle of the quad (near the fountain) to Park drive, to the top of the embankment on the west side where it drops off to the creek - is approximately 2.82 acres in size. The architect suggested 10 acres min. Additionally, that would significantly reduce the type of co-located open play space needed, compound the current parking frustrations, and take out approximately 35 trees.

4. Phasing/Scaling

a. Is there a background and recommendation for scaling the facilities?

Yes, MacPAC, at the recommendation of city staff, considered the entire proposal under the same lens the city was using at the time on all city services. At the time the categories of - below base level, base level, mid level and optimal level were used as part of the core services work for budget priorities.

In turn, MacPAC scaled their recommendations to different levels in their final report:

RECREATION/AQUATIC CENTER, SENIOR CENTER & LIBRARY

Next Steps

MACPAC LEVELS OF SERVICE

With consideration for the next steps, the MacPAC developed a range of levels of service for the Recreation/Aquatic Center, Library and Senior Center projects. The charts on this page and the following summarize the current facility condition and levels of service ranging from base to mid and optimal. This information will be a valued resource and referenced with additional planning work to refine and right size the facilities.

RECREATION/AQUATIC CENTER

	BELOW BASE (CURRENT)	BASE	MID	OPTIMAL		
AQUATIC & REC CENTER(S)	Deteriorating AC & CC, not enough capital maintenance and building management funds, unprogrammable space which leads to lost revenue options, not accessible, space does not match current programming needs.	<p>OPTION 1 Keep AC & CC at current locations and current sizes.</p> <p>Repairs are made, deferred and ongoing maintenance is adequately funded. In addition, investments are made at both facilities to remove accessibility barriers. Both buildings would have a radical refresh and potential remodels to make space more programmable.</p> <p>OPTION 2 One new facility at either site analyzed for optimal scenario - replacing the same size and scale aquatic amenities as at the current aquatic center (Lap pool: 56'x25 yards; Warm water pool: 2,160 sq') and with the same size gym and two rooms similar to rooms 102 and 103 at the current Community Center.</p>	<p>New rec center, < 124,736 sq', scaled down from optimal level.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Indoor lap pool at 25 yards x 32 meter 4,000 sq' family pool with water play features (fountains, slides, etc.) Gym with one court Drop-in childwatch center After school/youth center 1/2 size gymnastics room Elevated walk/jog track Weight/cardio space Group exercise studio Multi-purpose room Catering kitchen One craft/classroom spaces Indoor playground 	<p>New approximately 124,736 sq' facility at Linfield University owned property or Mac W&L property (if not an outright property purchase from either party or if additional partners want to share the facility, the City will need to reevaluate the size of amenities included here). If other sites are reviewed, MacPAC's location criteria should be used to evaluate.</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td> <p>NEW!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gym with 2-courts Drop-in childwatch center Dedicated gymnastics room After school/youth center 50 meter x 25 yard lap pool with deep water and 12-13 lanes (in a separate room than rec pool) with seating for 500 6,000 sq', 4-6 lane indoor warm water family pool with water play features (fountains, slides, etc.) Diving boards, slides, climbing walls and/or swings in pool </td> <td> <p>IMPROVED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Elevated walk/jog track Weight/cardio space Group exercise studio Multi-purpose room Catering kitchen Two craft/classrooms Indoor playground </td> </tr> </table>	<p>NEW!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gym with 2-courts Drop-in childwatch center Dedicated gymnastics room After school/youth center 50 meter x 25 yard lap pool with deep water and 12-13 lanes (in a separate room than rec pool) with seating for 500 6,000 sq', 4-6 lane indoor warm water family pool with water play features (fountains, slides, etc.) Diving boards, slides, climbing walls and/or swings in pool 	<p>IMPROVED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Elevated walk/jog track Weight/cardio space Group exercise studio Multi-purpose room Catering kitchen Two craft/classrooms Indoor playground
<p>NEW!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gym with 2-courts Drop-in childwatch center Dedicated gymnastics room After school/youth center 50 meter x 25 yard lap pool with deep water and 12-13 lanes (in a separate room than rec pool) with seating for 500 6,000 sq', 4-6 lane indoor warm water family pool with water play features (fountains, slides, etc.) Diving boards, slides, climbing walls and/or swings in pool 	<p>IMPROVED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Elevated walk/jog track Weight/cardio space Group exercise studio Multi-purpose room Catering kitchen Two craft/classrooms Indoor playground 					
OUTDOOR AQUATICS OPTION 1	Splash at Discovery Meadows	Outdoor aquatics should be deferred like other outdoor amenities and included in the Parks and Open Space Master Plan process.				
OUTDOOR AQUATICS OPTION 2	Splash at Discovery Meadows	Outdoor 25 yard 6 lane lap pool with adjacent spray ground as part of either the current facility option above or the new facility option above.				

SENIOR CENTER

BELOW BASE	BASE (CURRENT)	MID	OPTIMAL		
<p>Senior Center closes due to lack of resources to staff and maintain the building. Some senior programming continues at Community Center.</p> <p>Funding to construct building was provided through a community development block grant and that would need to be addressed in some way.</p>	<p>Senior Center being minimally maintained and no long term management plans.</p>	<p>In existing building - refresh inside, update to more accessible restrooms, improve internal circulation, upgrade existing fitness room, add sun shades outside.</p>	<p>1,300 sq' addition to existing 10,000 sq' building at Wortman Park</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td> <p>NEW!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Large covered entry with automatic doors • Greenhouse • Patio with outdoor seating • Better connection with Wortman Park • Safer parking lot circulation • Outdoor suggestion: Pickleball court, bocce ball court & other park amenities </td> <td> <p>IMPROVED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better circulation inside • larger dining room • Restroom updates • New flooring, paint and finishes throughout </td> </tr> </table>	<p>NEW!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Large covered entry with automatic doors • Greenhouse • Patio with outdoor seating • Better connection with Wortman Park • Safer parking lot circulation • Outdoor suggestion: Pickleball court, bocce ball court & other park amenities 	<p>IMPROVED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better circulation inside • larger dining room • Restroom updates • New flooring, paint and finishes throughout
<p>NEW!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Large covered entry with automatic doors • Greenhouse • Patio with outdoor seating • Better connection with Wortman Park • Safer parking lot circulation • Outdoor suggestion: Pickleball court, bocce ball court & other park amenities 	<p>IMPROVED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better circulation inside • larger dining room • Restroom updates • New flooring, paint and finishes throughout 				

LIBRARY

BELOW BASE	BASE (CURRENT)	MID	OPTIMAL		
<p>Continue in current library building and let the building decline through lack of funding for maintenance and improvements.</p>	<p>Continue in current building with funding for maintenance and improvements.</p>	<p>Add on to current building to increase capacity for borrowing collections and community use including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Larger children's room • Maker space • Increased library of things • Study rooms • More restrooms 	<p>New 29,756 sq' library built at Current Aquatic Center Site, after new pool is built.</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td> <p>NEW!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More restrooms • Visual access & greater connection to City Park • Landmark/corner presence along HWY 99 West • Improved safety and visibility through site design • Flexible and adaptable layout • Cafe • Increased library of things (tools, etc.) • Study rooms </td> <td> <p>IMPROVED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Larger children's area • More meeting room space • Increased after hours access • Staff efficiencies (check in/check out process) </td> </tr> </table>	<p>NEW!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More restrooms • Visual access & greater connection to City Park • Landmark/corner presence along HWY 99 West • Improved safety and visibility through site design • Flexible and adaptable layout • Cafe • Increased library of things (tools, etc.) • Study rooms 	<p>IMPROVED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Larger children's area • More meeting room space • Increased after hours access • Staff efficiencies (check in/check out process)
<p>NEW!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More restrooms • Visual access & greater connection to City Park • Landmark/corner presence along HWY 99 West • Improved safety and visibility through site design • Flexible and adaptable layout • Cafe • Increased library of things (tools, etc.) • Study rooms 	<p>IMPROVED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Larger children's area • More meeting room space • Increased after hours access • Staff efficiencies (check in/check out process) 				

In May, 2024, initial voter polling showed 52% support for the optimal level proposal. At the time, with a slight majority of support, the strategy to build more support through public engagement at events over the summer, outreach and education began. The direction then was to shoot for an election no sooner than May 2025, with polling again in late fall.

Unfortunately, after the November 2024 election, another likely voter poll was done that showed support had dropped for the overall project at the optimal level and the polling firm and consultants advised City Council that going to a vote in May 2025 was not advisable due to the decrease in support.

b. Scaling buildings, scaling finances v. phasing buildings, phasing finances

There are many different ways to look at scaling or phasing. The first is sequencing or phasing of issuing the debt/bonds. That will be discussed in more detail in April.

Another option would be to move forward with the mid level recommendations from MacPAC rather than the optimal level. That would reduce the overall scope of construction for each element, which theoretically should reduce the costs (staff cautions that significant and unexpected inflation has occurred since the original cost estimates for the facilities were done).

Another option would be to remove one or more elements from the overall package. The current CPR project includes the new proposed recreation center, updates and expansions at the Senior Center and Library, as well as park improvements.

From: [Heather Richards](#)
To: [Jeff Towery](#); [Claudia Cisneros](#)
Cc: [Darcy Reynolds](#)
Subject: FW: Graffiti Notice
Date: Wednesday, February 12, 2025 6:33:54 PM
Attachments: [image011.png](#)

Hi Jeff and Claudia,

The email below was sent to all of the City Councilors and I did not see you on the email distribution group so forwarding for your records.

Jeff, if you hear about from any of the councilors and have direction on how you want Darcy and I to respond. Let me know, otherwise I will work on a response with Darcy and share it with you prior to sending it to City Council.

Have a great day!

Heather



Heather Richards
Community Development Director
503-474-5107 (phone)
971-287-8322 (cell)
www.mcminnvilleoregon.gov

From: Darcy Reynolds <Darcy.Reynolds@mcminnvilleoregon.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, February 12, 2025 2:12 PM
To: Heather Richards <Heather.Richards@mcminnvilleoregon.gov>
Subject: FW: Graffiti Notice

This might have already been forwarded to you. I'm planning of course on following up with Garrett but wanted your suggestion on closing the loop with the Mayor and Council members?

Thanks!

From: Garrett Scales [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, February 12, 2025 11:24 AM

To: Darcy Reynolds <Darcy.Reynolds@mcminnvilleoregon.gov>
Cc: Mayor Kim Morris <Kim.Morris@mcminnvilleoregon.gov>; Sal Peralta <Sal.Peralta@mcminnvilleoregon.gov>; Chris Chenoweth <Chris.Chenoweth@mcminnvilleoregon.gov>; Daniel Tucholsky <Daniel.Tucholsky@mcminnvilleoregon.gov>; Zack Geary <Zack.Geary@mcminnvilleoregon.gov>; Jessica Payne <Jessica.Payne@mcminnvilleoregon.gov>; Scott Cunningham <Scott.Cunningham@mcminnvilleoregon.gov>
Subject: Graffiti Notice

This message originated outside of the City of McMinnville.

To Whom It May Concern,

Yesterday I was sent a notice from the city regarding Graffiti on my fence along the publicly owned and operated Goucher Pathway. Contained in that letter was a threat of potential charge or citation for not getting it cleaned.

The reason that I take issue with this is because, on multiple occasions, I have already spent my time and money to clean up the fence because the city cannot seem to put any security measures in along the pathway. My house has been vandalized via egging on more than one occasion and graffitied multiple times before this notice. That is not to mention the people who ride their ATV's along the pathway nearly every day.

Furthermore, it does not make any sense for me to spend more of my own time or money, to clean up property that the city will not help to keep clean. Every time graffiti is cleaned off of my fence it is obvious and thus creates a target for more graffiti to take place.

Lastly, I don't think it is fair for you to try and charge me, when I pay my taxes and constantly have to look at messes left by homeless folks on public owned or city maintained property. Attached are pictures I took along 2nd, Adams and Fellows Streets of messes in publicly owned or maintained areas. Additionally I attached other pictures from along the Goucher Pathway and surrounding areas where there is vandalism on city owned or maintained property.

When the messes on city owned and maintained property are cleaned up I will be more than willing to clean the graffiti up, but until then it feels like the pot calling the kettle black.

Thanks,

Garrett Scales























ENTERED INTO THE RECORD
DATE RECEIVED: 02.11.2025
SUBMITTED BY: Andy Bleckinger
on behalf of
SUBJECT: Yamhill SWCD
Public Comment

From: [Andy Bleckinger](#)
To: [Claudia Cisneros](#)
Cc: [City Recorder Team](#); [Jessica Payne](#)
Subject: Re: Approval of Amendments to West Hills Subdivision
Date: Tuesday, February 18, 2025 12:59:47 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image005.png](#)
[We sent you safe versions of your files.msg](#)
[2025.01.27 City of McMinnville Oak Letter.pdf](#)

Mimecast Attachment Protection has deemed this file to be safe, but always exercise caution when opening files.

This message originated outside of the City of McMinnville.

Hello Jessica and Claudia,

Sorry for not sending the letter through the proper channels. I will make sure to do so in the future. Attached is the letter. Please let me know if you need anything else.

Thank you,

Andy Bleckinger (he/him)
Executive Director
Yamhill Soil & Water Conservation District
2200 SW 2nd St, McMinnville, OR 97128
503-479-8643



[Website](#) | [Facebook](#)

On Tue, Feb 11, 2025 at 9:39 PM Claudia Cisneros
<Claudia.Cisneros@mcminnvilleoregon.gov> wrote:

Hi Andy,

Thank you for your email/public comment. Unfortunately, we didn't receive your email in time to enter into the record for tonight's City Council meeting. Could you please provide me with a copy of the letter you included in your original email? We will enter it into the record for the 02.25.25 City Council meeting.

Thank you!

Claudia



City of McMinnville

Claudia Cisneros, CMC
City Recorder/City Elections Officer
503-435-5702 (desk)
230 NE Second Street
McMinnville, OR 97128

Monday – Thursday 7:00 a.m. – 5:30 p.m.

Website: <http://www.mcminnvilleoregon.gov> | [Recorder Page](#) |

PUBLIC RECORDS LAW DISCLOSURE: Messages to and from this e-mail address are public records of the City of McMinnville and may be subject to public disclosure. This e-mail is subject to the State Retention Schedule.

From: Jessica Payne <Jessica.Payne@mcminnvilleoregon.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, February 11, 2025 6:50 PM
To: Andy Bleckinger <andy@yamhillswcd.org>
Cc: City Recorder Team <CityRecorderTeam@mcminnvilleoregon.gov>
Subject: Re: Approval of Amendments to West Hills Subdivision

Thank you Andy.

I am grateful for your work to protect this centuries old trees.

FYI: for future reference, letters to the entire council need to go through the city recorder's office to accurately maintain public records and prevent serial communications. The recorder team will then forward documents to the councilors and ensure your comment has been added to the public record. Here is the email to send future communications to that you would like sent to the entire council. cityrecorderteam@mcminnvilleoregon.gov

Jessica Payne

Pronouns: She, her, hers
Ward 3 City Councilor

What ward do I live in? [Find out](#)



(971) 517-0957

jessica.payne@mcminnvilleoregon.gov



City of McMinnville

PUBLIC RECORDS LAW DISCLOSURE: Messages to and from this e-mail address are public records of the City of McMinnville and may be subject to public disclosure; the same is true for text communication sent to the phone number above. This e-mail is subject to the [State of Oregon Retention Schedule](#).

From: Andy Bleckinger <andy@yamhillswcd.org>

Sent: Monday, February 3, 2025 12:08 PM

To: Mayor Kim Morris <Kim.Morris@mcminnvilleoregon.gov>; Sal Peralta <Sal.Peralta@mcminnvilleoregon.gov>; Chris Chenoweth <Chris.Chenoweth@mcminnvilleoregon.gov>; Daniel Tucholsky <Daniel.Tucholsky@mcminnvilleoregon.gov>; Zack Geary <Zack.Geary@mcminnvilleoregon.gov>; Jessica Payne <Jessica.Payne@mcminnvilleoregon.gov>; Scott Cunningham <Scott.Cunningham@mcminnvilleoregon.gov>; Planning <Planning@mcminnvilleoregon.gov>

Cc: Barbara Boyer [REDACTED]

Subject: Approval of Amendments to West Hills Subdivision

Mimecast Attachment Protection has deemed this file to be safe, but always exercise caution when opening files.

This message originated outside of the City of McMinnville.

Dear McMinnville City Council Members, City of McMinnville Planning Division, and Mayor Morris,

Attached is a letter from the Yamhill Soil and Water Conservation District Board of Directors regarding the approval of amendments to the West Hills Subdivision. I have also

included Board Chair, Barbara Boyer in this email.

We sincerely hope to partner with City staff, departments, council members, and land development companies to strategize on best practices to conserve Oregon white oak habitat within the City of McMinnville and throughout Yamhill County. We are also available to provide technical assistance to anyone interested in conservation projects relating to natural resources.

We hope to hear from you soon.

Sincerely,

Andy Bleckinger (he/him)

Executive Director

Yamhill Soil & Water Conservation District

2200 SW 2nd St, McMinnville, OR 97128

503-479-8643



[Website](#) | [Facebook](#)



**YAMHILL SOIL & WATER
CONSERVATION DISTRICT**

January 27, 2025

To: McMinnville City Council Members, City of McMinnville Planning Division, and Mayor Morris

From: Yamhill Soil and Water Conservation District

Re: Approval of Amendments to West Hills Subdivision

Yamhill Soil and Water Conservation District (Yamhill SWCD) was disappointed to hear of the McMinnville City Council approving amendments to the West Hills Subdivision in December 2024 which was originally approved for development in 2017. This approval will eliminate approximately 50 acres of mixed woodland, primarily Oregon white oak which has been identified as a rare and declining habitat and a Strategy Habitat by federal and state governments. According to information printed in the News Register newspaper, at least 900 trees will be cut down in order to provide room for a new housing subdivision.

Yamhill SWCD has spent the last decade partnering with groups including the US Fish and Wildlife Service, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, Greater Yamhill Watershed Council, the Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde, and the US Department of Agriculture Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) to conserve oaks on private lands here in Yamhill County. We have been awarded two subsequent grants under the NRCS Regional Conservation Partnership Program of \$2 million dollars per grant and were recently awarded an additional \$6.6 million dollars to do important restoration work which will preserve this diminishing habitat type. The majority of this habitat has been lost due to development, including rural conversion to more profitable crops and to urban development. It is estimated that between 3-10% of this historic habitat remains in the Willamette Valley today. Over 200 native wildlife species are oak obligates, meaning that they depend on Oregon white oak for their continued survival.

We are disheartened to learn that the City of McMinnville is willing to eliminate this rare habitat and cause the decline of so many native species. As Councilor Sal Peralta stated, "White oak are slow growing, it takes 100 to 300 years for them to flesh out their canopy. Some of these trees were here before the first white settlers came to Oregon. Their cultural and natural significance of the trees can't be overstated," noting that 97% of Oregon white oak has been removed over the last 100 years. "Once they are gone, they will never come back in our lifetimes or the lifetimes of our grandchildren's children."

2200 SW 2ND ST, MCMINNVILLE, OR 97128 🌿 (503) 472-6403 🌿 YAMHILLSWCD.ORG

This action directly contradicts what the Yamhill SWCD and its partners including Yamhill County citizens have been working on for the past decade. We urge the City of McMinnville to complete their analysis of identified habitat and those values to the community versus conversion to development. We hope that this will result in ordinances which will protect Oregon white oak within the city limits and will prevent future loss of this critical habitat. At the very least, developers should be required to mitigate losses and be required to retain some amount of habitat in exchange for development. We would support a moratorium on new approvals for development in these areas identified by the city until the analyses and ordinances have been completed. We believe the City of McMinnville should follow the lead of state, federal and tribal agencies who have all identified this habitat as essential to our native wildlife population.

Yamhill SWCD provides technical assistance to anyone interested in conservation projects relating to natural resources. We are available to any City staff, departments, council members, and land development companies to strategize on best practices for the intended use. We hope you will reach out to our Executive Director, Andy Bleckinger, by phone at 503-479-8643, or by email at andy@yamhillswcd.org.

Thank you for your consideration and for supporting Yamhill County partners and citizens who care about Oregon white oak.

Sincerely,

Barbara Boyer

Barbara Boyer, Board Chair
Yamhill Soil and Water Conservation District

Liquor License Recommendation

BUSINESS NAME / INDIVIDUAL: Copious Cellars, LLC
BUSINESS LOCATION ADDRESS: 1421 NE Alpha Drive
LIQUOR LICENSE TYPE: Wholesale

Is the business at this location currently licensed by OLCC

Yes No

If yes, what is the name of the existing business:

Proposed business operations:

Manufacturing/production
Retail off premises sales

Tritech Records Management System Check: Yes No

Criminal Records Check: Yes No

Recommended Action: Approve Disapprove

Tim Symons

Chief of Police / Designee

City Manager / Designee



Local Government Recommendation – Liquor License

Per OAR 845-005-0304(3): The Commission requires an applicant for issuance of a new license issued under ORS chapter 471, to provide written notice of the application to the local government in the form of a complete, accurate, and legible Commission form.

The local government is as follows:

- (a) If the address of the premises proposed to be licensed is within a city's limits, the local government is the city.
- (b) If the address of the premises proposed to be licensed is not within a city's limits, the local government is the county.

INSTRUCTIONS:

Step 1: Applicant completes all of Section 1 (including top of Page 2).

Step 2: Applicant submits both pages of the form to the appropriate local government. NOTE: The local government may require additional forms and/or fees.

Step 3: Local government completes at least Section 2 and returns all pages of the form, or a copy thereof, to the applicant. The local government is allowed up to 45 days to complete Section 3.

Step 4: Applicant takes the form with at least Sections 1 and 2 completed and includes it with their CAMP application to meet the Local Government Recommendation document requirement. Submissions that do not have at least Sections 1 and 2 completed will not be accepted.

Step 5: The local government issues its final recommendation in Section 3 and returns the completed form to the applicant. If the applicant has already submitted their initial application via CAMP, they hold on to the final recommendation and provide it to their investigator, when requested. If they have not already submitted their application, they upload the fully completed Local Government Recommendation form with their initial application submission.

Applicants within the city of Portland ONLY: After completing the attached form, please follow these steps to complete the Local Government Recommendation process:

- Apply via the [City of Portland website](#).
- Once you have completed the application with the City of Portland, you will receive an email notifying you that your application has been accepted, usually within two business days. The email will contain an attachment titled "ABC Public Notice."
- Upload the ABC Public Notice document with your CAMP application to meet the Local Government Recommendation document requirement.

NOTE: This document only provides proof of submission. Once you receive your final recommendation from the City of Portland, you will need to provide that to your assigned OLCC investigator.



OREGON LIQUOR & CANNABIS COMMISSION
Local Government Recommendation – Liquor License

Annual Liquor License Types
Table with 2 columns listing various license types such as Off-Premises Sales, Limited On-Premises Sales, Full On-Premises, Caterer, etc.

Section 1 – Submission – To be completed by Applicant:

License Information

Legal Entity/Individual Applicant Name(s): Tyson Smith
Proposed Trade Name: Copious Cellars, LLC
Premises Address: 1421 NE Alpha Dr Unit:
City: McMinnville County: Yamhill Zip: 97128
Application Type: [X] New License Application [] Change of Ownership [] Change of Location
License Type: Wholesale [] Additional Location for an Existing License

Application Contact Information

Contact Name: Tyson Smith Phone: [REDACTED]
Mailing Address: [REDACTED]
City: Portland State: OR Zip: 97239
Email Address: [REDACTED]

Business Details

Please check all that apply to your proposed business operations at this location:
[] Manufacturing/Production
[] Retail Off-Premises Sales
[] Retail On-Premises Sales & Consumption
If there will be On-Premises Consumption at this location:
[] Indoor Consumption [] Outdoor Consumption
[] Proposing to Allow Minors

Section 1 continued on next page



Local Government Recommendation – Liquor License

Section 1 Continued – Submission - To be completed by Applicant:

Legal Entity/Individual Applicant Name(s): Tyson Smith

Proposed Trade Name: Copious Cellars, LLC

IMPORTANT: You MUST submit this form to the local government PRIOR to submitting to OLCC.
Section 2 must be completed **by the local government** for this form to be accepted with your CAMP application.

Section 2 – Acceptance - To be completed by Local Government:

Local Government Recommendation Proof of Acceptance

After accepting this form, please return a copy to the applicant with received and accepted information

City or County Name: McMinnville

Optional Date Received Stamp

Date Application Received: February 5, 2025

Received by: Tim Symons

Section 3 – Recommendation - To be completed by Local Government:

- Recommend this license be granted
- Recommend this license be denied (Please include documentation that meets [OAR 845-005-0308](#))
- No Recommendation/Neutral

Name of Reviewing Official:

Title:

Date:

Signature:

After providing your recommendation and signature, please return this form to the applicant.