

Eagle Urban Renewal Agency

Tuesday, September 1st, 2015
Regular Meeting
Eagle City Hall
660 E. Civic Lane, Eagle, Idaho

1. CALL TO ORDER – The meeting was called to order at 6:02PM.
2. ROLL CALL: REYNOLDS, BUTLER, MCFARLAND, KUNZ, RIDGEWAY – All members are present. A quorum is present.
3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE – The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.
4. ADDITIONS, DELETIONS OR MODIFICATIONS TO THE AGENDA – None
5. REPORTS BY BOARD MEMBERS, ATTORNEY AND SECRETARY – Mary McFarland spoke with Mark Priddy about possible grading of the Rembrandt’s dirt parking lot at their expense. She shared contact information for Wagner Farms, the company that will be grading the former Tri-City Meats properties.

Jeff Kunz disclosed he owns a townhouse at 100 S. 2nd St., outside of the agency’s district boundaries. He reported the Smiths consider demolition to be substantially complete and asked who would like to participate in the on-site inspection.
6. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – August 4th, 2015 minutes

McFarland made a motion, seconded by Jim Reynolds, to approve the minutes. A voice vote was taken. The motion passed unanimously.
7. TREASURER’S REPORT – Lindsey Pretty Weasel was not present; Kunz gave a brief report.
 - A. Review of vouchers and checks.
 - B. Review of bank statement.
 - C. Review of profit and loss sheet and balance sheet.
8. UNFINISHED BUSINESS:
 - A. Consideration and possible action on hiring of a public outreach consultant to assist with development of a prioritized project list.

Consultant Ashley (Ford) Squyres (223 W. Village Ln., Boise, ID) clarified the agency’s objectives and expectations. The agency’s FY 2016 budget contains no project-specific line items, but could be amended, if necessary. This will be a collaborative effort between the community, agency and partners. Resources capable of providing assistance were identified. The anticipated timeframe is after the November 2015 elections when new officials will be seated. The agency’s initial brainstormed list of criteria and unprioritized projects will need to be updated. The prioritized project list will encompass the entire district. Squyres noted guidelines, flexibility and an implementation commitment will be needed.

Stan Ridgeway mentioned possible restructuring of the agency. The Board deferred this topic until after the November 2015 elections when new officials will be seated. Mark Butler proposed asking the city council to consider this sooner.

Squyres said she could have an initial proposal ready and submitted before the next meeting.

Butler made a motion, seconded by Ridgeway, that Squyres provide a proposal at least one week before the next meeting and that the Board consider the proposal and possibly take action on hiring Squyres at the next meeting. A voice vote was taken. The motion passed unanimously.

- B. Consideration and possible action on a funding request for construction of an alley and related improvements on approximately six properties located on the north side of E. Idaho St. between N. Eagle Rd. and N. 1st St.

(Butler recused himself due to a conflict. He explained the nature of the conflict.)

Walt Lindgren of Johnson Architects (139 N. 2nd St., Eagle, ID) summarized a \$110,916 funding request to construct an “E. Idaho St. alley.” He emphasized the relationship between urban renewal, public input and the city’s comprehensive plan and cited the transportation and economic development sections in support of the proposed project and the advantages (e.g., blight elimination, growth, improved connectivity and pedestrian safety, urban grid preservation) to impacted properties and downtown core.

Reynolds asked Lindgren whether he had been approached by anyone ready to develop the properties and how many residences were occupied. Lindgren said he had not been approached by additional developers within the last month and that of the five properties fronting E. Idaho St., one property (a double lot) is undeveloped and the other residential properties are currently occupied.

Ridgeway said the agency received public input about two blighted properties near the Eagle Rd./State St. intersection, but no one has approached him about cleaning up the blighted properties on E. Idaho St. He referenced Wayne Hoffman’s article on urban renewal agencies, what they are designed to do and what they actually do. He proposed the agency draft a letter stating the funding request will be revisited when development plans become available. He felt the funding request is premature and the agency’s purpose is not to subsidize developers. Lindgren cited the development challenges and responded that how the properties develop will depend on the agency’s financial commitment; otherwise, the properties will languish. Lindgren sought project approval contingent on a qualified development being identified.

McFarland asked if the Ada County Highway District (ACHD) was requiring the alley and how an agency could require one private property owner to make improvements that benefit other property owners. That didn’t seem quite right to her. Lindgren said he requested a letter from ACHD; however, their policy is not to provide a letter on an application unless one is formally requested. Lindgren cited the relevant ACHD policy. McFarland asked if the proposed project would pencil without collaboration and without the agency’s financial assistance. Lindgren responded it is difficult to know who would develop the properties and how development would play out.

Kunz noted Hoffman’s article was published in *Valley Times* and *Eagle Informer*. He quoted an ACHD spokesperson who said the property is unopened, unmaintained right-of-way that never became a public alley. He spoke with a long-term Eagle resident who, after checking with three individuals who lived on E. Idaho St., confirmed a public alley never existed. He questioned whether the properties would necessarily develop as envisioned (with rear-loaded facilities accessed via the proposed alley) and why the agency would spend public funds on improvements that may or may not be necessary in the absence of development plans. He recommended a “concurrent” approach – the agency could revisit the funding request as development plans emerge. Lindgren was unsure whether a concurrent approach could work.

(An opportunity for public comment was provided. No one offered public comment.)

McFarland made a motion to approve the expenditure provided a viable development comes before the Board. The motion died for lack of a second. Ridgeway asked about the legality of committing a future Board to such an expenditure. McFarland asked whether a commitment would need to be revisited when Board membership changes. Attorney Gary Tanner responded that, theoretically, an agreement could be drafted to address funding contingencies and constraints. McFarland amended the motion to a date certain, by the December 2015 meeting. Reynolds asked, and McFarland affirmed, that funds would have to be set aside to fulfill an obligation, if approved. The amended motion died for lack of a second.

9. NEW BUSINESS – None

10. ADJOURNMENT. McFarland made a motion, seconded by Reynolds, to adjourn. A voice vote was taken. The motion passed.