

**Roll Call:** Meeting was called to order at 6:30. Members Kevin Seiler, Carol Brzeczek, Cindy Christensen, Jason Henderson, Jack Rychecky and Bill Hopping, were present. Joseph Orrino was absent. Steve Kemp and Tiffany Hooten were also present.

#### Minutes

Brzeczek moved to approve the minutes. Rychecky seconded the motion. Hopping suggested we add the meaning of PEL on page one under public comment and on the last page add additional language that he included in reference to the recent election regarding our governance and structural issues. He did not have specific language and left it to Brzeczek to refer back to the tape of the meeting so it could be included.

Motion to amend was made (as stated above) by Hopping and seconded by Henderson. Motion to amend was approved 6/0 and the main motion to approve was passed 6/0.

#### Public Comment

None.

#### Financial Report

Tiffany Hooten presented the financials for both October and November. Only change is the collection of interest. The total fund balance is \$344,555.29. In January a refund to the County will be made totaling \$25,000, which will conclude the abatement refund.

Rychecky moved to accept both October and November budgets. Henderson seconded and motion was approved 6/0.

Rychecky mentioned that the meeting archives for October and November were not up on the website. Christensen will look into.

#### Committee Reports

Henderson reported that he and Orrino have identified and spoken with two firms with experience in eminent domain and urban renewal. The scope of work has been discussed with both and the subcommittee recommended that a study session be scheduled, perhaps after the Jan. 10, 2019 meeting, to have the entire board interview both firms.

Seiler suggested that the questions used for the last interview process be reviewed and if there are other suggestions please share with the subcommittee.

#### Application Documents Subcommittee

Rychecky provided an overview of the goals of the subcommittee. Rychecky thought our documents should include definitions to which Henderson was in favor. Rychecky

presented two different scenarios – one where the project manager goes to LIFT before going to the city and the second where the project manager goes to the city first. Seiler thought it was fine to mention the reference to going to the voters but he thought Columbine Square was grandfathered in. Kemp was uncertain referencing a case in Wheat Ridge that may indicate any charter amendment would be pre-empted by the state statute. So if we were to get a project we will then have to address that question.

Seiler thought the application document work should continue even though Columbine Square property owners have submitted a plan and have indicated that they do not want to use urban renewal for redevelopment. So the urgency is not as great but it is prudent to get the document finalized so we are prepared when and if something comes up.

Brzeczek, in reference to Kemp's comparison of Littleton's Charter Amendment to Wheat Ridge's, said they are very different. Wheat Ridge passed an amendment that subjected the URA decisions to a vote of the people and Littleton's Charter Amendment subjects the city council's decisions related to Section 64.5 to a vote of the people. And, even though Columbine Square does not want to use urban renewal the LIFT board needs to be aware of Senate Bill 279 that requires any modification of an urban renewal plan without a specific project is to be considered a substantial modification and will be required to go through an approval process as a substantial modification.

Kemp said he was familiar with the Wheat Ridge he thought some issues may well come up.

Seiler said there are still things we can do such as a matching grant program.

Hopping asked if all the development objectives need to be met by a plan. He asked for clarification. With regard to the Pro Forma financial information he asked for the inclusion of Project Development Budgets and Project Income Statements for a minimum of five years. He also suggested that the market studies be changed to indicate debt service. He then asked if it would be a good idea for the city staff to review them. Kemp suggested we send them to the city manager and let him determine which staff members should review them. Brzeczek suggested we wait until we have a cleaner draft.

Comments should be submitted to Rychucky – a deadline will be determined and communicated to the LIFT board.

#### Unfinished Business

Discussion with the Columbine Square Property Owners – discussion will be postponed until after breakfast with council, which will be rescheduled.

Henderson has reapplied to be on the LIFT board.

New Business

Executive Director - Seiler said one model would be to use city staff to respond to some of our needs. He also mentioned that Arvada's URA is laying-off and there may be someone from their organization that would be available. Rychecky suggested that a retired banker or lender might be a good option as well. After discussion a clear direction of what to do about an executive director is unknown but there are several options to explore.

Public Comments

Jeanie Erickson does not believe the city staff should be involved with any review of an application. LIFT is completely separate from the city. An executive director is needed. In some cities the council is the urban renewal authority but that is not how it is in Littleton. You are urban renewal – city council is not.

Pam Chadbourne said the streets that are mentioned in the streetscape are not in the Columbine Square urban renewal area and maybe it is not appropriate for LIFT's consideration. She said LIFT will need in both engineering and financial expertise and the city staff, most of which are new, do not have the needed expertise to provide advice to LIFT.

Meeting adjourned at 7:33pm