

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

Christianson moved to approve the agenda. Motion was seconded by Henderson and passed 7/0.

#### Public Comment

Linda Knufinke expressed her concerns about improvements on Belleview being outside the boundaries of the Columbine Square Urban Renewal Plan Area.

Jeanie Erickson expressed her concern about LIFT's financial condition – could we afford a bond attorney and an executive director, a new survey of conditions and any election required. She heard the presentation at council's study session regarding the Belleview Corridor – it was a pretty picture but there were lots of questions. Half of Belleview is in Englewood. How does that impact things – will it be pretty on one side? She questioned how UR money could be spent across the entire corridor.

Pam Chadbourne also saw the council study session and said it was not founded on anything. It is pretty pictures – nothing more. There is no analysis that this concept could work. Belleview means “beautiful view.” And what they picture is not a beautiful view. She requested that some of the space be reserved and the beautiful skies, sunsets and mountain views be preserved. We need to preserve the authenticity of the northern part of Littleton. People like the character of the neighborhood as it is. She believes the plan serves the developers and our job is to serve all of the people. PEL has been around for two years – this is a manufactured crisis. The justification for this is weak – where is the community buy in? Plan was developed behind the scenes as the mayor said – it is for the developers and our job is to serve all the people.

#### Financial Report – None

#### Committee Reports

**ID-18-387** – Update on Attorney Search – Orrino reported that the one applicant withdrew their application. After discussing with their team our needs and resources did not match with theirs. If we have immediate needs they are available to us.

After talking to the Moye/White applicant, Orrino said he learned that a smaller firm is less likely to respond to such a lengthy RFP.

Seiler proposed that we target three or four firms and solicit a more simplified package. Christianson suggested we use the website to post the RFP along with a brief statement.

Rychecky brought up the idea of using a retainer to get an attorney through the application process. Developers will not like waiting for us to find an attorney and he thought a retainer might be the way to go.

Hopping disapproved of money should being put into an escrow account. There are methods of mutual release of the money that should be considered.

Rychecky mentioned that we have a loan agreement with the City that will need to be negotiated in the near future.

Kemp saw two items for the board – the loan agreement and if city council and LIFT want to talk about an IGA on Bellevue.

Rychecky said that begets the point – how far is our reach with the current increment? We need independent counsel.

Seiler said no one disagrees with Rychecky – we all recognize at some point in time, sooner than later, we need an attorney if we move forward with a matching grant program in the area. He was not comfortable with a retainer – it can be expensive – if you don't use it you lose it and that would not be in the best interests of our citizens. He wanted to see what Henderson and Orrino could come up with firms that specialize in this area and slim down the RFP. Ask for cost proposals and ask them their terms.

Hopping asked if there was such a thing as a letter of intent?

Brzeczek believed, from the work done on the process documents, LIFT needs an attorney much sooner than later.

Seiler asked if the group supported an expedited process with possible candidates at the December meeting?

Rychecky moved the search for legal representation be done by the subcommittee and targeted solicitation with interviews conducted by the subcommittee and brought back to the board as a whole for approval. Motion died for lack of a second.

Brzeczek moved to charge the subcommittee with reviewing the application process in such a way that it will not require a lengthy process, cull through the responses and determine which candidates or candidates will come before LIFT for an interview and that the subcommittee target firms that specialize in urban renewal. Hopping seconded. Motion passed 7/0.

#### **ID-18-388 – Applications Documents Report**

Rychecky reported for the subcommittee. The documents required have been simplified but the flexibility to ask for more documentation remains. What is needed will vary with different projects so there needs to be some customization for what financial and organizational documents we will require. The big question is who will do the work?

He pointed out the three Cs (Character, Capital and Capacity) of financing in the draft document. We will need to know whom we are doing business with and who is behind them – there's a lot of footwork for someone. We have to know how all the pieces fit together. Do we have the financial capacity to issue bonds and pay for them? The subcommittee proposes to lower the \$60,000 fee to \$10,000 to determine how much money it will cost LIFT to do the work needed. The developer will have to pay as we go. And then there's the election costs – who pays?

Brzeczek said there's another set of processes that have to be determined as well that deal more with internal processes.

Rychecky thought we needed to be searching for entities that can be gatekeepers on a part-time basis for LIFT and do the preliminary work.

Brzeczek asked if it would be likely that some attorney firms might have a staff that could do some of the gatekeeper functions? The answer is yes but the fees will be much higher.

Hopping thought we needed an executive director or someone who knows what they are doing and suggested it as a topic for a study session.

Seiler said it could be and suggested that the subcommittee might look into if there are firms that do this. Having one UR area is not cost effective and the previous executive director did not do the due diligence necessary for LIFT. Then Seiler suggested a study session after the next meeting.

Rychecky said some municipalities use city staff but we are not in that position. This will be expensive and we need to start a search not unlike the attorney search. Once we have a project we will have \$10,000 to help fund the expertise needed.

Seiler asked the members to submit their comments/suggestions on the draft documents to the subcommittee either prior to or at the next study session.

#### New Business

**ID#-18-379** Discussion of potential IGA agreement for LIFT to invest in Streetscape with the City for the Belleview Corridor –

Seiler said LIFT would be seeing a presentation on possible movement that city council is taking on the Columbine Square area and Belleview Corridor Master Plan. If undertaken it would change the feel and look of the corridor and Columbine Square and it may be an opportunity to partner to invest in a streetscape in that area. He asked for LIFT's support for him to enter into preliminary discussions with the city. Henderson did not object as long as Seiler would report back to the full board and that Kemp would

not be representing LIFT but the city council. Hopping said it would be strictly exploratory. Brzeczek objected and thought any discussion should be with the entire board in public. Seiler said if we had an executive director that would be the person to do this and he fully intends to have our legal representative review any agreement but this is just to expedite the process. He would have no authority to enter into any agreement.

Rychecky amended the motion to add the Vice Chairman to participate in the discussion. Orrino seconded. Rychecky thought LIFT should have two people that can report back – not because of a lack of trust but two people absorbing the information is better than one. Amendment passed 7/0. Main motion passed 6/1 with Brzeczek opposing.

**ID#-18-380** Discussion regarding a Study Session with Columbine Square Property Owners –

Seiler proposed a study session with the Columbine Square property owners. He proposed to work with city staff to identify the current owners and invite them to a study session in January or February to start having discussions with them about their challenges. What do they need to see their business thrive and move forward? We need to learn their issues so we can start making decisions how we can partner with them.

Driscoll asked Jocelyn Mills if we have heard from the Columbine Square owner in the last two to three months. Mills said no. He had a conversation with a limited partner and had been told that there would be something by the end of the year.

Hopping thought the staff should be consulted for format of the meeting.

Brzeczek thought LIFT had some homework to do before moving forward. LIFT needs to understand their financial situation before they can make any offer to any property owner.

Seiler said he did not intend to make any offers. He wanted to move forward and hear from property owners what they need to move forward. And then ask ourselves how that fits in with what we can do legally. We may hear great ideas – we don't know what they are facing.

Christenson thought small groups would be good. Seiler wants an engaging process. Rychecky said he would be more comfortable if the city lead and LIFT participated. Hopping thought Mills and her staff had done a good job with these types of meetings.

Brzeczek said that even though some thought the city did a good job engaging citizens if you talk to the people that live over there they would not agree that it was a good

process. People want to engage. There used to be District meetings in the council chamber that were well attended and well managed and got a community conversation going. The meetings were dynamic and they brought out the conflicts within the community bringing a reality to the discussion that no one will be completely happy with the outcome. We need to get property owners, business owners and citizen engaged with each other to have a good outcome. Henderson said he wants to know what they are thinking because we don't know.

Seiler said we keep focusing on one property owner and there are many others. If they come forward and we find that we are off base we can ask them what they are looking for. Henderson said it sounded like interviews to him. He would like to hear about their problems. Seiler said it would be nice to know what their vision is so when a proposal comes forward we have more information for consideration. He wants a positive discussion – it is more about listening. Christianson thought it might be beneficial for us to get an idea of how we want it to happen. Brzeczek suggested that the topic be brought back for the December meeting.

#### **ID#-18-381 Board Member Terms Discussion**

Brzeczek said there had been errors made in the past with board appointments. Rather than appointing members to fulfill terms several new appointments were made for the entire five-year term. She believed there was one correction left to make and that is Henderson's appointment. He was appointed to a term ending in 2022 and his term expires in Jan 2019. Under the circumstances she thought the board might want to consider sending a request to city council about appointing Henderson for a second term since it was his term that had been incorrectly assigned. In the past the LIFT board had forwarded their reappointment recommendations to the city council so this would not be something new. Kemp thought the corrections had been made. Henderson said he would be happy to reapply.

#### **Public Comment**

Leisa Sacry lives behind Columbine Square and it impacts her. Referring to the Bryant Flink presentation to come she said the city hired individuals to create these gorgeous pictures but in reality this is not what she would expect. She liked the picture depicting open space but the some of the pictures were radical changes that she did not like. Let the people talk – no more surveys. Anyone can take a survey including those that live outside the area and they will not be impacted by the changes they support. If you were in my shoes what would you like to see – this is not ground zero like Belmar. She hoped that we would let the citizens to be heard.

Jeanie Erickson asked what do the property owners want from UR? Did LIFT realize that not one of them asked to be in the UR area - not one! However, several property owners wanted out of the slum and blight area and said they didn't need the city's help.

She attended all three corridor meetings. The first one citizens were allowed to ask questions for city staff to respond to and for the entire audience to hear. After that meeting the format went to poster boards. You can count how many people attended but when they stay for two minutes the count really doesn't represent participation.

Pam Chadbourne talked about a conflict of interest. Completion bonds are a big deal – we need a risk analysis. Riverfront Authority got a second opinion four months after they signed the deal. Writer Corp was selected for that project because they were thought to be prosperous and flush but Riverfront still failed. She also asked how changes would be handled.

Regarding the meeting with property owners – LIFT's job is not economic development. The city has a department for economic development – LIFT's job is to clear slum and blight - not economic development. Two years ago the Columbine Square owner said he would have a plan in a month or two – and still, two years later, nothing.

Linda Knufinke referred to the Columbine Square UR Plan vision - section 3.1 that speaks to fostering the small town family friendly character. In Appendix A the Citywide Plan of 2015 is included with the number one priority on page 38 – the hometown feel.

She said the Centennial Square area goes to council for a rezoning in December. Regarding public input – that is not required – it already took place in the process for approving the plan

Hopping thought LIFT should have a briefing on the recent election ~~outcome~~ *about governance issues. City council has certain protocols that they like all their boards and commissions to follow and we should be consistent with them and we need to make sure we are in compliance.* Brzeczek said the election issues had no bearing on LIFT *as what passed was a charter issue.* Seiler asked Kemp to provide a memo if there was anything we needed to consider. *Rychecky said we have another layer of government now that South Metro was providing fire service and that they should have a seat at the table and a letter of agreement. Seiler said they did not need a seat at the table but we probably need a letter of agreement. Once the memo is received from Kemp if the board wants a study session to discuss it further that can be scheduled.*

#### Adjourn

Rychecky moved to adjourn at 7:45 and Henderson seconded. Motion passed 7/0.