

EAGLE URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY

Minutes (Revised)

May 3, 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 6:02 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:** None

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

Kunz defers his report until later in the meeting just prior to adjournment in deference to individuals in attendance that have items to present.

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 an update on the current revenues and current expenditures for the agency.

7. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** April 5, 2016 minutes
April 6, 2016 minutes

Naomi Preston moves to approve the minutes of both of the meetings. Seconded by Stan Ridgeway. ALL AYES: MOTION CARRIES...

8. **UNFINISHED BUSINESS:** None

9. **NEW BUSINESS:**

- A. **Discussion of a possible reimbursement agreement with Eagle 26, LLC and Pacific West Communities, Inc. for public improvements on the Eagle 26 property (also known as the Eagle Rodeo grounds).**

Kunz introduces the item.

Caleb Roope, President/CEO of The Pacific Companies and Pacific West Communities, Inc., is taking this opportunity to make initial contact with the agency on a potential owner participation agreement and reimbursement agreement for their Eagle 26, LLC project.

Roope reviews several projects he is involved with in Eagle. Some of these projects have agreements which have already been entered into, including the East End Marketplace, Edgewood Crossing and Eagle Lakes.

Kunz inquires about potential recreational facilities at Eagle Lakes, as discussed at the last meeting. Discussion for clarification.

Roope reviews aspects of the Eagle 26, LLC project including: project access; relocation of the Ballantyne Canal; the potential removal of some properties from the 100-year flood plain; property improvements, including water and sewer lines, parking, sidewalks and historic street lights as well as landscape improvements. He reviews the projected costs associated with the improvements as well as the prioritization of said improvements. The preliminary cost for the improvements associated with the project is \$977,000. Roope notes that they have not begun the land use planning process with the City of Eagle, and do not anticipate doing so until possibly November or December of this year. They have done preliminary work on pad site locations. At this time, they are looking at 2-3 acres of the total 26 acres being commercial and utilizing the remaining acres for residential development. At build out of this potential project, he estimates total assessed revenues being \$50 million, with annual revenues of almost one-half million dollars to the agency.

Discussion between Roope and agency members. Craig Soelberg inquires if other types of uses have been considered for the property, something larger that would accommodate larger employers similar to TSheets. Preston likes the option of residential, and feels like it will make a positive impact on local businesses. Stan Bastian asks if the city has thought to hire a consultant to do analysis and make recommendations regarding economic development for the city? He said doing so would help the city determine what the best and potential use is for the property. Kunz responds that the city is currently seeking to hire a consultant for the rewriting of the economic development chapter of the comprehensive plan. He states that it appears that about half of the proposed improvements are items that would have to be agreed to, and in place, by the time the Ada County Highway District (ACHD) proceeds with the Plaza Dr. extension in November. With the applicant not anticipating land use application submittal until around that time, the previously mentioned project items would need a separate agreement due to installation/construction timing. He has additional concerns with aspects of the proposal that would have the agency agreeing to things that may be subject to a reimbursement agreement, while no application has been brought forth to the city for consideration.

Kunz asks for clarification on the density and type of residential housing associated with the project. General discussion.

Roope states that with further research, the driving economic factors would be determined. They are looking at high-density residential, with town homes similar to Paddy Row Subdivision, multi-family up to 20 units to the acre, 350 - 450 units on the full 26 acres. Also, approximately 30 units of assisted living is a possibility.

Ridgeway states that as no land use application has been submitted, to have a discussion regarding reimbursement is premature, especially as it has not been formally received by the city. Kunz asks if because of the timing of the Plaza Dr. extension improvements, there is no way Roope could wait until November to submit a land use application. Roope

discusses the land use application submittal timeframe. He does not anticipate the land use application will be brought before the city until the end of the year.

Greg McVey, 737 N. 7th St., Boise, ID. McVey reminds the council of a discussion had with ACHD; that the developer cannot approach the council with a development until they (ACHD) go out to bid. So the developer's hands are tied due to this policy. They cannot approach council regarding a land use application prior to bidding, or ACHD will pull the funding and the applicant will have to pay.

Ridgeway has concerns with discussing infrastructure installation and costs prior to the submittal of an application. He said it is putting the cart before the horse. His concern is one agency placing another in a position that forces certain actions by another agency. An application has not been submitted, and while interesting information has been presented, until a formal land use application has been submitted, no further action would be appropriate. Bastian agrees with Ridgeway's concern with the addition that the Plaza Dr. extension will be made, and ACHD has agreed to that development. Based on his past experience, he would prefer to proceed slowly and ensure that ACHD does construct the Plaza Dr. extension, and this should be a priority and should be accomplished. He said that to take action prior to the construction of the Plaza Dr. extension could cause the city's relationship with ACHD to be in jeopardy if we were to commit to anything at this time. General discussion.

John Rennison, 410 E. State St., Eagle, ID. Rennison discusses public parking along Plaza Dr. and the conversation that has been had with ACHD, so they are in the loop in regard to this aspect of the potential development. Additional discussions have been had with ACHD regarding infrastructure on Plaza Dr. He feels that Kunz's recommendation to break the project into two components – one aspect being the Plaza Dr. extension improvements and other aspect being the east connector road improvements – may be advantageous and said we should see if some of these improvements can be dovetailed into, not particularly ACHD's contract, but some of ACHD's other contracts so some of these improvements would be performed concurrently with ACHD. The thought is that when the ribbon is cut, the sidewalks, street trees and the street lights would already be installed.

Bastian and Ridgeway express concern regarding the timing of this discussion in relation to the fact that no land use application has been heard, and the Plaza Dr. construction as stated earlier. Ridgeway also points out that we are cooperating with ACHD for the construction of the road in the amount of about \$500,000 for the sidewalks and the improvements on the north side of Plaza Dr., and now the agency is being asked to do the improvements and infrastructure on the south side of the road without any plans for development being submitted. He said it could be a great project depending on what is eventually brought forward, but it remains cart-before-the-horse at this point. Kunz seeks confirmation that the applicant has discussed these things at some level with ACHD. Rennison confirms that the additional parking lane has been discussed with ACHD and they are very open to and receptive to that being included in the plan. With regard to the other frontage improvements, the view is that the improvements would be required of the developer regardless of what is ultimately approved by the city, and that it would be nice to see it completed with the initial construction. Continued discussion on the timing of this discussion.

Bastian agrees to the two-part phasing of this proposal. Soelberg would like to see more research pertaining to economic indicators prior to the agency spending the type of money that the developer is proposing. Is there a perception problem or an actual problem with urban renewal if 80 or 90% of our urban renewal monies are going to one company or one group of companies? General discussion. Ridgeway states that the agency has been consistent when approached to not take action until the land use approvals are in place, and he believes the agency should stay the course and stay consistent.

Roope states that they are only asking for reimbursement when and if they deliver tax increment revenues that are realized, for their installation of public improvements associated with the project. This is only a first discussion and not a specific request of funds at this time. He is more than willing to seek more information about economic impact. If it is the agency's wish, they can come back with more specifics and with a possible letter of intent. Roope states they will not do anything to derail or throw off course the Plaza Dr. extension. Discussion regarding timing of the land use application submittal.

Preston comments on the perception of monies going to one company or group. She states that there have not been a lot of other companies approaching the city to develop these empty lots. She's glad that Roope and his group are interested in Eagle and investing in it. This is an opportunity to upgrade the downtown and increase the vibrancy of the downtown.

Kunz states that he feels that the Cedar Ridge public road extension would be a function directly of what develops on that property and that would be another distinction to be made. General discussion.

0. PUBLIC COMMENT:

Greg Neruda, 416 E. Knoll Dr., Eagle, ID. Neruda states that he is a 16-year Eagle resident, and he and his business partners are the new owners of Rembrandt's Coffee House. They want to meet and reach out to organizations that can help maintain a sense of place and culture for downtown.

Ridgeway asks about the new owners' plans for Rembrandt's. Neruda states the historic church structure will remain a retail business with expanded evening hours and will offer plates of food and beer and wine. He states Rembrandt's will be closed for two months for remodeling.

Soelberg mentions the Downtown Business Committee is organizing events for Eagle Fun Days. Neruda states the new owners would like to be involved.

Neruda introduces Chris Cacioppo, one of the business partners. He states there is a metal sculpture on the patio they would be interested in donating to the city for placement at a municipal park.

Bastian asks about Rembrandt's parking plans and improvements. Neruda expresses interest in partnering with others to ensure sufficient parking is available. Bastian explains the former Tri-City Meats property is privately-owned and the property owners will decide how their property will develop and how it will work to the betterment of the community.

9. NEW BUSINESS:

B. **Review the evaluation process for responses to the Request for Proposals (RFP) 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 Dr. extension.**

Kunz introduces the item.

Attorney Todd Lakey states the agency received two responses – from The Land Group and RiveRidge Engineering Company – to the Request for Proposals (RFP). A subcommittee reviewed and scored the responses and made a recommendation on which company, if any, should be retained to perform the engineering services. Initially, three of four subcommittee representatives scored the response from RiveRidge Engineering Company highest. The scores were very close. After deliberation, the subcommittee unanimously recommended RiveRidge Engineering Company, based on their recent completion of the engineering services for the right-in, right-out access located on the south side of State Highway 44, their established relationships and experiences with the Idaho Transportation Department (ITD) and other stakeholders and their specific 60-day schedule of completion of engineering services. The Land Group’s estimated timeline was a little more flexible and was approximately three-plus months in duration. The Land Group said they would work with the agency on adjustments to the proposed timeline. The subcommittee discussed that The Land Group is based in Eagle and the primary engineer for RiveRidge Engineering Company lives in Eagle.

Attorney Lakey explains the agency’s two options are to (a) accept the subcommittee’s recommendation to retain RiveRidge Engineering Company to perform the engineering services; or (b) take the subcommittee’s recommendation under advisement, but score and rank each of the responses and make its own decision on which company, if any, to retain to perform the engineering services.

Ridgeway moves to accept the subcommittee’s recommendation to retain RiveRidge Engineering Company to perform the engineering services and to direct the agency’s attorney and chairman to negotiate and finalize a professional services agreement to be brought to the board for review and approval. If the negotiations are unsuccessful, the agency’s attorney and chairman will come back to the board for a discussion on how to proceed. Seconded by Bastian. ALL AYES: MOTION CARRIES...

C. **Discussion and possible action on a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the City of Eagle to provide certain planning services and accompanying Resolution 16-006.**

Kunz introduces the item.

Attorney Lakey introduces the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to provide planning services (e.g., generation of maps and lists of property owners). He notes the city staff’s priority will continue to be city business; however, if sufficient bandwidth exists, the city staff could assist the agency with certain planning services. Reimbursements would occur at the hourly rate of the individual performing the services, plus a 30% administrative overhead rate.

Bastian moves to approve Resolution 16-006, a resolution of the Board of Commissioners of the Eagle Urban Renewal Agency of Eagle, Idaho, approving the

Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the Eagle Urban Renewal Agency and the City of Eagle for planning and other related services; authorizing the execution of the MOU by the chairman or vice-chairman and secretary; authorizing any technical changes to the MOU; authorizing the EURA staff to take all necessary action required to implement the MOU; and providing an effective date. Seconded by Soelberg. Bastian: AYE; Kunz: AYE; Preston: AYE; Ridgeway: AYE; Soelberg: AYE. ALL AYES: MOTION CARRIES...

D. Discussion and possible action on a reimbursement request for food provided at the April 6, 2016 strategic planning work session.

Kunz introduces the item.

Ridgeway moves to approve a \$72.05 reimbursement request, payable to Jeff Kunz, for food provided at the April 6, 2016 strategic planning work session. Seconded by Soelberg. Ridgeway lets the chairman know that he should submit such receipts for reimbursement in the future, as a part of the agency's regular business. Bastian: AYE; Kunz: ABSTAIN; Preston: AYE; Ridgeway: AYE; Soelberg: AYE. FOUR AYES AND ONE ABSTENTION: MOTION CARRIES...

5. REPORTS BY BOARD MEMBERS, ATTORNEY AND SECRETARY (CONTINUED):

Kunz reports that he and Consultant Ashley Squyres of AF Public Solutions, LLC met on April 22, 2016 to discuss the public participation process for development of the agency's prioritized project list. Several issues were identified, including who should be involved in the public participation process (i.e., the property owners and business owners within the agency's district boundaries versus a more inclusive set of participants). Soelberg suggests the public participation process should be more inclusive, if possible, and should be coordinated with the City of Eagle's comprehensive plan update process ("Eagle is HOME").

Kunz mentions the Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT) analysis has not been completed. The agency still needs to generate strategies that (a) use its strengths to take advantage of opportunities; (b) use its strengths to avoid threats; (c) take advantage of its opportunities by overcoming weaknesses; and (d) minimize its weaknesses and avoid threats. These "strategies" will become "projects" on the agency's prioritized project list.

Kunz seeks the board's input on the level of public participation during the SWOT analysis and the generation of strategies. Bastian asks how the public could participate. As an example, Kunz mentions that at public open houses, the agency could display its lists of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats and its list of strategies and the public could contribute to these lists.

Kunz seeks the board's input on the timing of the public participation process. He notes the public participation process could be affected by the agency's reorganization and expansion of its district boundaries. He proposes mid-June 2016 as the potential date for the first open house to enable the agency to gain a better understanding of its reorganization and expansion of its district boundaries. He mentions the city's mayor and attorney and the agency's chairman and attorney have scheduled a meeting to discuss these matters.

There was general consensus that the public participation process should include opportunities for the public to provide input on the agency's strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats, the generation of strategies and the identification of projects. The

agency could then take these public inputs and complete the SWOT analysis, the generation of strategies and the identification of projects. Soelberg envisions the agency's reorganization being deferred until the strategic plans and district boundaries have been finalized.

10. **ADJOURNMENT:**

Ridgeway moves to adjourn. Seconded by Bastian and Preston. Kunz asks for any opposition to the motion. Hearing no objections, the meeting is adjourned by unanimous consent.