

**MINUTES
RENEWAL WHEAT RIDGE
August 4, 2015**

1. GENERAL

1.1 Call the Meeting to Order

The meeting of Renewal Wheat Ridge was called to order by Chair Davis at 5:45p.m. in the Council Chambers of the Municipal Building, 7500 West 29th Avenue, Wheat Ridge, Colorado.

1.2 Roll Call of Members

Board Members Present: James Bahrenburg
 Tim Rogers
 Kristi Davis
 Walt Pettit
 Jesse Hill
 Janet Leo

Board Members Absent: Shane Nicolson

Also Attending: Steve Art, Urban Renewal Manager
 Corey Hoffmann – Legal Counsel
 John Batey – Pueblo URA
 Katherine Correll – Downtown Colorado Inc.

1.3.1 Approval of Minutes

It was moved by Bahrenberg seconded by Pettit to approve the minutes of June 16, 2015 as presented. The motion carried 6-0. Rogers commented the minutes were very thorough and would like to see them in such a manner in future meetings.

1.4 Public Forum:

None

2 Presentations:

2.1 – Hoffmann provided information on the Fair and campaign practices act. Board members may do whatever they like as long as they are acting on their own accord and state they are not acting on behalf of the board or the URA.

Hill asked: What is meant by soliciting for a question? Hoffmann said that if city facilities are being used, then it gets very close to the ‘line in the sand’. After a URA meeting, the line is grey.

Tim Rogers asked about the term “political subdivision” as stated in the memo. Hoffmann says it means any part of the city or URA. Hoffmann spoke to producing materials with factual summaries and providing it to the public. Hoffmann recommends not producing such a piece because it can be interpreted as advocating for an issue.

Rogers asked if Hoffmann meant that we cannot have an opinion as a board. Hoffmann said that is incorrect, the board could have an opinion, but it needs to be done by a resolution. Rogers thinks we should have a resolution not supporting the initiative. Hill wants info on how the initiative will affect the URA and its goals. Hoffmann said the only thing we can speak about at this time is if the ballot measure meets the requirement to be placed on the ballot as a question. Not until the initiative is approved or denied, will legal counsel feel they are comfortable providing an opinion. Hill would like a legal opinion on the Agreement for 38th and Wadsworth is valid if the initiative is approved. Hoffmann recommends not having his firm provide this opinion. Rogers believes that even if an opinion was done before the election, it will still end up being litigated. Hill wishes we would have spoken about this before we approved the Agreement with QDP. Hoffmann said it was the developer who should have done their homework on their comfort part of this development. Davis commented that it’s not her role or the role of the Council or Board to evaluate the initiative.

Hill made a motion to begin legal counsel on the legitimacy of the initiative to the new projects, active projects, and specifically the 38th and Wadsworth project and the mechanics of future projects. How does it look if a vote were required? There was no second on the motion.

Davis led a discussion based on the use of TIF and the impact of the initiative on TIF. Rogers would like to have answers. How do we get them? Hoffmann said he would provide in an executive session if requested. Hill wants it to be in a public forum for transparency. Rogers says it’s a fact that the initiative will have an impact on Wheat Ridge new development. He says we are representatives of the URA are the entire community when we vote on each project.

Pettit said that the board was selected as a representative of the community. He is not voting on his own, but the feelings of his constituents. He thanked Rogers for his input and thoughts.

Davis spoke about other projects, specifically the 44th and Wadsworth project and our investment into the property of about \$5.5M. It’s a great project, but had a lot of risk. TIF is a tool, the city is not investing until the revenue is flowing to secure the debt. TIF is a tool that we want for the Authority. Her worry is that if it passes, we will put ourselves in riskier situations in hopes that we stimulate development.

Hill wants a session on ‘How we got here’. Rogers thinks perhaps a ‘de-brief’ of our actions of the URA. Hoffmann thinks it happens after the election.

Rogers asked for consensus to have a resolution on both sides of the issue pertaining to the TIF ballot question. To be presented at the next URA regular meeting. Hill objected to the consensus. Hoffmann will prepare the resolutions.

3 Action Items

None

4 Board Study Session

Jon Batey and Katherine Correll led the discussion on how the board wishes to proceed forward with revenues. Batey spoke about the need/requirements of the plan. He spoke about resources that could be used for leverage funds. He spoke about cash fund activities. They also use reimbursement approach. It is the easiest and cleanest.

Davis asked that if the reimbursement approach is used, is the funds still restricted as any of our agreements. Batey said they still must be allowable improvements. Rogers asked what is NOT allowed. Any improvements that are specific business improvements are not allowed.

Batey provided 5 steps of using TIF revenues:

- Step 1 – The Plan
- Step 2 – Resources
- Step 3 – RFP
- Step 4 – Design Development
- Step 5 – Bid the activity

Davis spoke about spreading the word of the URA and what we have done. Producing materials to be sent. Pueblo does this type of work. It is done mainly online and printed materials and press releases. DCI has done work to look at other URA's and most do a poor job on telling their stories.

Hill asked if funds can be used for marketing. Yes, if it is project specific and not just 'tooting a horn' for URA. Bahrenberg said we have done a poor job of 'tooting our horn'.

Leveraging – Batey spoke about leverage of our dollars. Asking the developer for additional site improvements with participation. The question was asked about staff negotiations versus the Board having direct input.

Davis asked about the Littleton initiative, Hoffmann reported that their initiative is about amendments to the plan and not about limiting TIF.

Art asked if the group would identify how they would use TIF revenues:

Rogers wanted us to brand our projects better with signage
Rogers wants more outreach to citizens about the URA and its activities. Fill the information gap. Leo asked if we are constrained by law about use of funds for marketing. Hoffmann felt we are not constrained to the WR Cyclery land, but can use it to promote the corridor.

Hill asked if monies could be used for maintenance. Yes it can but be aware of the long term effects. (safe and clean activities)

Can it be used to put on an event: you really have to link it to a way it will remediate blight. If you can make the link, then Yes. (creating foot traffic)

Structured parking.

Leverage in vacant properties.
Engage a public improvement programs

Signage program
Artwork
Façade improvements
Affordable housing (citywide)

Other

Hill would like to have an analysis be done for TIF related projects nearing completion. This analysis features the catalyst this project caused, how it affected the community, how it performed versus their analysis, et al.

1. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by Chair Davis at 8:03 p.m.



Kristi Davis, Chair



Steve Art, URA Manager