

EAGLE URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY

Minutes

June 7, 2016

The Eagle Urban Renewal Agency welcomes public comment on all agenda items except those which specifically state, "NO PUBLIC COMMENT WILL BE TAKEN ON THIS ITEM." When public comment is not allowed, it is either because the public comment period was held and closed, or the item is an "EXECUTIVE SESSION" item subject to sole review by the agency and its representatives, or other reason as stated by the chairman.

Individuals are asked to limit their remarks to three minutes, and more time is afforded to group representatives. If you want to submit written comments on any item, please do so at least 24 hours in advance to ensure board members have time to read and consider your views. Written comments can be dropped off at Eagle City Hall and e-mails may be sent to info@eagleurbanrenewal.org.

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting is called to order 6:00 p.m.
2. **ROLL CALL:** KUNZ, RIDGEWAY, BASTIAN, PRESTON, SOELBERG. All present. A quorum is present.
3. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:** Jeff Kunz leads the Pledge of Allegiance.
4. **ADDITIONS, DELETIONS OR MODIFICATIONS TO THE AGENDA:**

Stan Ridgeway moves to add a "Public Comment" item to the agenda between items 5 and 6 or between items 6 and 7. Seconded by Naomi Preston. ALL AYES: MOTION CARRIES...

4.5 **PUBLIC COMMENT:**

Richard Ames, 120 N 2nd St., Eagle, ID. Ames provides input on the structure of the new agency board. He would like to suggest that one of the board seats be reserved for a resident that lives in the agency's district. He would like at least one or two people to properly represent the citizens that have seen the changes. Both Preston and Craig Soelberg state this is a great idea, although Soelberg mentions the board couldn't mandate such a requirement (in case no volunteer meets this requirement), but states that an order of precedent could possibly be given to volunteers that live within the agency's boundaries. General discussion.

5. **REPORTS BY BOARD MEMBERS, ATTORNEY AND SECRETARY:**

Kunz reports that city staff has informed the agency that the responses received to the Request for Proposals (RFP) to revise the economic development chapter of the city's comprehensive plan will be reviewed at an upcoming meeting and that the agency should have a representative at that meeting. Both Stan Bastian and Kunz express interest in representing the agency at the meeting. Bastian will be the agency's representative.

Kunz reports the agency has undertaken a number of reimbursement and settlement agreements that will potentially come due within the next two calendar years. He cites the agreements and costs. He asks the board to consider the creation of a second account to keep the money separate from our working capital. General discussion. The board decides to handle these agreements and funds using standard accounting practices without creation of a second account.

6. **TREASURER'S REPORT:**

- A. **Review of vouchers and checks.**
- B. **Review of bank statement.**

C. Review of profit and loss sheet and balance sheet.

Treasurer Lindsey Pretty Weasel gives the report; the balance is missing three small deposits made today.

7. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** May 3, 2016 minutes

Ridgeway makes a motion to table the minutes until the next meeting in order to revise the minutes. He said he has gone through the audio of the last meeting and feels that comments and suggestions have been omitted from the minutes. General discussion. Ridgeway would like the board to decide if they would like minutes verbatim or as a synopsis. Soelberg states that he would like the minutes to be a synopsis. More general discussion. Preston also likes the idea of a synopsis format for the minutes. Attorney Victor Villegas notes that written minutes are legally required.

Ridgeway moves to table the minutes until the next meeting in order to revise the minutes. Seconded by Bastian. ALL AYES: MOTION CARRIES...

8. **UNFINISHED BUSINESS:**

A. **Discussion and possible action on a funding request from the Beautify Downtown Eagle Committee for planters, flowers and street signs to identify and unify downtown Eagle.**

Kunz introduces the item.

Naomi recuses herself and presents the project. The project goals are to provide aesthetically appealing signs for downtown Eagle in the urban renewal district, to encourage pedestrian traffic downtown, to unite the east and west sides of downtown and to provide additional signs for businesses to encourage customer traffic. The committee seeks funding for five standalone wayfinding signs and seven wayfinding signs to be attached to existing lamp posts (for a total of twelve wayfaring signs) as well as planters and flowers, maintenance and marketing. The committee would like to have maps and a contest to promote the event. The street signs, planters and flowers will be placed at 12 locations along Old State Street in public rights-of-way owned by the Ada County Highway District (ACHD). The total project cost is \$27,110. The committee is proposing that the total project cost be divided equally between the agency (at \$13,555) and the City of Eagle (at \$35,000). The committee will ask the city for half of the total project cost at a future council meeting. General discussion. Preston suggests that project implementation be turned over to the city due to the expertise required for sign installation.

Kunz moves that the agency authorize a not-to-exceed expenditure of \$13,555 for the Beautify Downtown Eagle project, including the signage contained herein (within the project proposal as presented); that the not-to-exceed amount of \$13,555 will be one of the conditions within an agreement and accompanying resolution to be drafted by the agency's attorney; and that proof of expenditure by receipt will be required before the agency proceeds to make the actual payment for the expenditure, even if project control is turned over to the City of Eagle. Seconded by Bastian.

Ridgeway asks what would happen if a supplier or fabricator requires a deposit. Kunz asks whether a supplier or fabricator would require a deposit. Preston responds she does not know because a supplier or fabricator has not indicated whether he/she would require a deposit.

Kunz amends the motion to request that the committee investigate whether a supplier or fabricator will require a deposit and, if so, that such conditions be reflected in the agreement. Re-seconded by Bastian.

Ridgeway asks about the grant the committee applied for and how the grant monies would be used. Preston responds that the grant is for this particular project and that the grant monies, if received, would be given to the agency and the city. She states the grant is currently pie-in-the-sky.

Kunz clarifies that the funds authorized by the agency are for Phase 1 of the project, that everything done for this phase of the project will occur strictly within the agency's boundaries and that these conditions will appear within the agreement. Preston concurs and notes that future project phases would be beyond the agency's boundaries.

(The amended motion proceeds to a vote.) Bastian: AYE; Kunz: AYE; Preston: ABSTAIN; Ridgeway: AYE; Soelberg: AYE. FOUR AYES AND ONE ABSTENTION: MOTION CARRIES...

B. Discussion on whether the agency's district boundaries should be expanded as a one-time amendment of the existing urban renewal plan or as a separate urban renewal project or not at all.

Kunz introduces the item.

Attorney Villegas presents a memo, prepared by attorney Todd Lakey, regarding the two boundary expansion scenarios by either a one-time expansion or creation of a new revenue allocation area (as part of a separate urban renewal project). He states the concern is the interplay of HB606, which becomes effective July 1, 2016, and whether expanding the agency's boundaries would trigger a reset of its base assessment roll. He said one of the things that will come into play is that the agency already has a revenue allocation area now and that, even with the effects of the new statute, it is okay to do a one-time expansion of up to 10% and that doing so will not reset the agency's base assessment roll. The question is whether or not the agency could have something in place before July 1st, 2016. Attorney Villegas doesn't think it is possible for the agency to complete the proposed boundary expansion before the new legislation takes effect. He said the agency can consider the one-time expansion of up to 10% and that doing so would not reset the base allocation roll. General discussion.

Kunz quotes from the conclusion of the memo: "The board does need to consider the cost of expanding the area, what the board would like to accomplish in the expanded area and consider the potential revenue gained with the potential costs of the desired improvements..." He mentions that the estimated cost of doing the required analysis, including the financial analysis, would be somewhere between \$10,000 and \$20,000 and that there is a question of how long the analysis would take. He asks the board to consider whether or not they want to proceed with the boundary expansion. General discussion.

Bastian and Soelberg express a preference for any possible boundary expansion to be undertaken as a one-time expansion. General discussion.

Bastian, Ridgeway, Preston and Soelberg would all like to see more information and analysis. General discussion.

Kunz states that the boundary expansion may be a decision for a future board at a later date, Bastian agrees. General discussion.

9. **NEW BUSINESS:**

A. **Consideration and possible action on a Professional Services Agreement (PSA), and accompanying Resolution 16-007, for engineering services for a right-in, right-out access located on the north side of State Highway 44 halfway between N. Eagle Road and Edgewood Lane and a collector roadway connecting the right-in, right-out access to the Plaza Drive extension.**

Kunz introduces the item.

Attorney Villegas states that he spoke with attorney Lakey, who reviewed the agreement. Lakey has no revisions to the agreement.

Kunz explains the agreement and reads portions of the agreement (i.e., the scope of work) aloud. He asks the board to consider approval of the agreement with the specific conditions as stated. The engineering services will cost at least \$35,000 and could go as high as \$38,000.

Ridgeway makes a motion to approve Resolution 16-007, to be executed after ITD approvals are gained, with the basic understanding that it is a \$35,000 contract, with a possible increase if the storm water issue reports are not available, for a not-to-exceed total of \$38,000, if needed. Seconded by Preston.

Soelberg seeks clarification on the split of the engineering services costs among the four stakeholders. Kunz responds that the equal split of the engineering services costs among the four stakeholders is covered by a separate, previously-approved agreement.

Based on advice from the agency's attorney, Kunz asks the maker of the motion to, rather than stipulating specific conditions in the motion, to authorize approval of the Professional Services Agreement (PSA) as written, with the specific conditions contained therein.

Ridgeway amends the motion (as stated by Kunz, to approve the Professional Services Agreement (PSA) as written, with the specific conditions contained therein). Re-seconded by Preston. Bastian: AYE; Kunz: AYE; Preston: AYE; Ridgeway: AYE; Soelberg: AYE. ALL AYES: MOTION CARRIES...

10. **ADJOURNMENT:**

Kunz asks for any objections to adjournment. Hearing no objections, the meeting is adjourned by unanimous consent at 7:08 p.m.