

**MINUTES
URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY
March 3, 2008**

Commissioner McCabe called the Moscow Urban Renewal Agency meeting to order at 7:00 a.m. Monday, 3rd March in the Moscow City Council Chambers.

Attendance:

| <u>Commission Members</u> | <u>City Staff Present</u> | <u>Others Present</u> |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| John McCabe, Chair | Gary J. Riedner, City Supervisor | Pat Raffee |
| Robin Woods | Jen Pffifner, Asst. City Supervisor | Susan Wilson |
| Brandy Sullivan | Stephanie Kalasz, City Clerk | Tara Roberts |
| Tom Lamar | Don Palmer, Finance Director (7:59) | |
| Jack Nelson | | |
| John Weber | | |
| Steve Drown | | |

1. Approval of Minutes - February 21, 2008

Nelson moved and Weber seconded approval of the minutes. The minutes were approved as presented.

2. Accounts Payable - Don Palmer

This was heard as item 3. Woods moved and Sullivan seconded approval of the accounts payable. Motion carried unanimously.

3. Final Draft Legacy Crossing Urban Renewal Plan - Pat Raffee/Gary J. Riedner

This was heard as item 2. Riedner said he would first go through the exhibits. He said the plan map has not been changed. He displayed and discussed the zoning map and proposed zoning map included in the plan. He said the assumptions for the plan are based on the proposed zoning. He displayed the proposed development matrix and map completed by Community Development and explained how the assumptions were made. He said these assumptions are based on 100% redevelopment in 24 years in the yellow areas. They were as conservative as possible for these assumptions for the economic feasibility study. He said the Economic Feasibility Study was developed by Mike Cady and Don Palmer and he gave an overview. He said a 1% per year base growth of the City was set. He said additional growth begins in year four.

Woods asked about the reference on page 1 of the Economic Development Feasibility Study to a small building increasing value by millions. Riedner said that can be taken out but the numbers can be checked to see if the comment checks out. Nelson said base value can go down if a building is torn down. Riedner said if a building is razed and a new building is developed the same year that would not be the case. He will check into it. He said the amount of money for parking has been increased. There are other costs that have not been put together previously. He said brown fields is another concern for the area because of the industrial nature of the previous uses. An environmental firm gave an estimate of \$600,000 for a possible clean-up. He said sidewalks, etc. were not in the hard infrastructure costs and have been accounted for here. Lamar asked about the \$600,000 and Riedner explained how the number was calculated. There was discussion about environmental clean-up.

Nelson asked if the property owner should be responsible for clean-up of environmental problems. Riedner said the property owner should have some responsibility and the Anderson Group was

put in touch with Steve Gill, of the Department of Environmental Quality, because there are programs to help property owners with clean-up costs.

Raffee said the page numbers will be put back into the report. She went through the report from the beginning to see if anyone has concerns. Drown asked if landscape or openscape development could be used for the first bullet on the third page because it is more comprehensive. Woods asked about some of the timing listed in the last page paragraph of page 2 and was told that it is statutory. Raffee said A through G start getting into information obtained at the various public meetings in regard to wishes for this district. She explained the pages containing legal requirements. She said the description of the project area is a layman's version. Riedner said nothing has been identified that the URA will develop but the possibility is there. He said Alturas I and II were very specific. There was discussion about how detailed the plan should be in certain areas. Drown asked that "green infrastructure" be included in the general section of the plan. It refers to landscape development, connection, quality of open space and stormwater development. Riedner said it could be included. Drown will bring a definition of the term to Riedner. There was discussion about how the term should be included. Item 6, in General Overview, will have green infrastructure and waterway improvements after what is already listed.

Raffee continued with the plan discussion. She said the participation agreements relate to the type of development partnerships that the URA can take in this district. There is also information about cooperation with public bodies. She said the demolition area is more specific. Woods said Section 309, last paragraph, indicates that the URA will sell property and wondered if property must be sold. Raffee said the URA would not want to keep property in the area because it would not generate increment. Woods confirmed that the City would take ownership of the infrastructure. Lamar asked about continued maintenance. Riedner said we are not assuming that public areas will be privately maintained. Raffee said Section 312, second paragraph, draws out revenue sources for the URA. Drown asked for examples of grants. Raffee said there are transportation grants and community development block grants. She said they are often matching funds. She said the art funding paragraph includes amenities and it can be decided on a project by project basis. Drown asked if there is an art funding mechanism. Riedner said there is some opportunity, it just depends on the will of the public, URA and Council. Raffee said there is 3% increment for public art in one of the districts in Coeur d'Alene and there is 0% in another district because the developer is putting it in. Lamar said he needs to think about whether this URA should specify a specific amount.

Raffee said the plan discusses land uses but it is fairly general. She said construction matches up with what is in the existing Building Code. She said the PUD overlay zone is mentioned in this area as well. She said we won't have the new valuation numbers until about the time this is getting adopted. There is a big gap between the amount of valuation available for a district and the amount that is anticipated. Nelson said we have few industrial uses and more residential properties. The 10% takes a big portion of the business properties. Riedner said it is hoped to create more of those business districts. There was a discussion about how the URA may assist with a façade of an existing development. Raffee discussed the financial limitations. She said it does allow for the developer to install improvements and the URA can pay the developer back with increment. She said that is how 5 of the 6 districts in Post Falls work. Riedner said 504.5 discusses the ability of the URA to rebate funds back to other taxing districts. It gives some flexibility to the plan. Raffee said there is potential for LID or BID in the district and there is information about how the URA would handle it. There is discussion regarding how the URA would interface with the City in regard to the Legacy Crossing Urban Renewal District.

Raffee said enforcement and duration of the plan are fairly standard. Lamar asked if there is a specific parking requirement. Riedner said no, it is just listed in the public infrastructure. Lamar said he wants to make sure that bike parking is considered with the other parking. He said we could provide additional covered bike parking to the developer. Riedner said the economic feasibility study includes multi-modal facilities. Lamar would like to include bike parking, especially covered bike parking. He said he thinks of benches in regard to street furniture and wanted to make sure that recycling and waste bins, bus stops and bike facilities were included with that and was told yes. Riedner said they have tried to make the plan as flexible as possible. Lamar said a lot of time, energy and money can be saved if people think about bike parking at the beginning rather than at the end.

McCabe and Drown left at 8:16 a.m.

Lamar suggested having another map indicating whether there would be development in areas even if there is no increment gain (University of Idaho property). Riedner said he isn't sure if that information is available or if there is any plan for the University to develop those areas. Lamar said it would be good information to have in terms of deciding what should be developed next to it. Weber said any developer would probably go to the University and ask prior to developing there.

Nelson left at 8:21 a.m.

There was discussion about having a map of the property owners in the project area. Weber said the property is always in flux and changes owners.

Lamar asked if there would be a logo for the Legacy Crossing District. There was discussion about how a logo might be created.

4. Review Calendar - Gary J. Riedner

Riedner said the only change on the calendar is that there is a meeting this Thursday.

5. Other Business

None.

The meeting concluded at 8:34 a.m.