



Minutes: December 9, 2009, 7:00

City of Moscow Council Chambers • 206 E 3rd Street • Moscow, ID 83843

Commissioner McCabe called the Moscow Urban Renewal Agency meeting to order at 7:06 a.m. Wednesday, the 9th of December, 2009 in the City of Moscow Council Chambers.

Attendance:

Commission Members	Staff Present	Others Present
John McCabe, Chair	Travis Cary, MURA Executive Director	Walter Steed, Moscow City Council
John Weber	Vim Braak, Intern	
Tom Lamar	Don Palmer, Treasurer (7:24)	
Steve Drown	Stephanie Kalasz, City Clerk	
Steve McGeehan		

Absent: Jack Nelson, Brandy Sullivan

McCabe opened the meeting at 7:06 a.m.

1. Consent Agenda - Any item will be removed from the consent agenda at the request of any member of the Board and that item will be considered separately later.
 - Minutes from November 13, 2009 Meeting
 - October Financials
 - November Payables

Weber moved and McGeehan seconded approval of the consent agenda. Motion carried unanimously by acclamation.

2. Public Comment for items *not on agenda*: 3 minute limit – No comment was offered.

3. Announcements (including conflict of interest disclosures if any)

Cary said he attended the Idaho Economic Development Conference instead of the Brownfields Conference and it was a good decision. He displayed a photo of a poster that was done by Terragraphics which was displayed at the New Orleans Brownfields Conference. He explained what is on the poster and said there was a presence of the URA without actual attendance. The poster is now hanging at DEQ headquarters.

4. Executive Director Report (Travis Cary)

- a. Revised Revenue Estimates – Cary discussed the revised estimate which was included in the packet. The assumption was that the URA would not get any of the School District levy but it appears that the URA may be where it was at the beginning. There is also a more accurate

number for the incremental assessed value which is slightly less. There was general discussion about the URA revenue estimates.

- b. Rexburg vs. Hart Decision – Cary said Rexburg v. Hart has been an on-going case. It was confirmed that an urban renewal agency is not an arm of the city and has the ability to incur long-term debt. He explained the nature of the case. There was discussion about whether this decision would be appealed. He said there is proposed URA legislation that might change the way people think about urban renewal agencies. The legislation may take care of issues that came up in the case.
- c. URA Legislation Update – Cary said there is a letter from Phil Kushlan in the packet. He is working on the legislation with Ryan Armbruster. Cary said a lot of people are looking at this and talking about it. He said the legislation is 59 pages so he didn't copy it for the packet but can send it via email if anyone is interested in reading it. He said it was a topic for discussion at the Association of Idaho Cities legislative meeting. The legislation differentiates between an economic development district and a renewal district. There are specifications as to the make-up of the URA board. It also discusses how elected officials should be involved and if they should be privy to executive session information. The changes will affect current boards and those changes could affect Moscow's Board. Moscow has more citizen representation than some other URA boards. He said questions and comments can be directed to him and he will forward them.
- d. Legacy Crossing Projects – Cary said he is in discussions with a developer who is interested in a large project in Legacy Crossing. He said the developer may come in to talk to the Board in January. It is a mixed use development and is quite large. He said there is the possibility of facility bonds that could provide incentive to move forward with the project sooner. It would likely be most appropriate for the facility bond to go through the City. This is a sophisticated project. The Department of Commerce is considering how the available allocations that were originally made to each county could be reallocated to ensure that the program is successful.

5. URA Commission Discussion (Travis Cary / URA)

- a. Commission Member Terms – Cary said there are potential changes to the make-up of the URA Board. Cary said he is not involved in discussions on re-appointments. He explained the way that the terms are written. He said he is not aware of any decisions that have been made. The decisions will likely be made by the next meeting. The next meeting may be cancelled if decisions have not been made.
- b. Meeting Schedule Discussion – Cary said if anyone has any thoughts on meetings, how often and when meetings take place as well as future meeting topics, please let him know. Lamar said if there are action items then it makes sense to have meetings but meetings with reports only could probably be skipped. He suggested having one meeting per month unless a second meeting is necessary. Drown said he thinks that would be a good thing to consider. There was general consensus that the meeting would be the 2nd Wednesday of the month and a second meeting could be held on the 4th Wednesday of the month if deemed appropriate. This will happen in January and the new Board can make a formal decision in January.

c. Future Meeting Topics – Cary asked for meeting topic suggestions. Lamar said he doesn't need a paper copy of the packet if he gets an electronic copy. Per Palmer, audit topics will be added to the next agenda.

6. Adjournment – The meeting concluded at 7:47 a.m.