

1 LIFT Regular Meeting Minutes  
2 Monday, July 12, 2018  
3 Page 1 of 2

4

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

9

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

12

13 New Business

14 **ID-18-236 – Motion to Approve minutes of June 21, 2018**

15 Henderson moved and Rychecky seconded to approve the minutes of June 21, 2018.  
16 Seiler asked that the spelling of his name be corrected. Motion passed 7/0.

17

18 Henderson moved and Hopping seconded to approve the minutes of the July 2, 2018  
19 special meeting. Minor corrections will be made to correct the spelling of the Chair's  
20 name and change Regular to Special Meeting. Motion passed 7/0.

21

22 Public Comment

23 Pam Chadbourne complimented LIFT on their meeting minutes saying they were  
24 very functional and awesome. Good minutes are very important to the citizens. She  
25 encouraged the board to continue with their search for their own attorney. She  
26 thanked LIFT for starting to take on the documents and urged us to compare them  
27 with other documents from other URAs. Or reference other sources for help.

28

29 Financial Report

30 **ID-18-238** – Hooten reported the only change in the financials was an additional  
31 \$526 and property tax increment of \$22. She will be drafting a letter to return the  
32 property tax increment to the appropriate taxing entities. She will work with Seiler  
33 to get this done. Rychecky moved and Brzeczek seconded to accept the financial  
34 report as provided. Motion passed 7/0.

35

36 Website Update

37 Seiler informed the city clerk that LIFT authorized the expenditure to hire Ervin  
38 from the city to update the website. Heffner will work with Ervin's supervisor to  
39 carve out some time for him to begin the updating process. Christensen will be the  
40 point person. Hopefully we will have a draft for the board to consider at the next  
41 meeting. We will need to make sure we have the correct info on the website about  
42 the Columbine Square UR Plan.

43

44 Seiler reminded that Christensen needs a short bio from each member.

45

46 Rychecky suggested that when the website is being developed that they set up a  
47 beta model with restricted access to the board. He believes that it is possible and we  
48 would be able to contribute edits. He would like for the board to be able to view the  
49 edits and offer suggestions to Cindy before things are finalized.

50

51 RFP Update

52 Henderson stated that the RFP had been updated to reflect seven years of practice  
53 to the requirements. Orrino said the RFP would be published in the newsletter in  
54 one week. He suggested another possibility for providing notice in the online Bar  
55 Association Classifieds that will allow a shareable link to the RFP. It would be an  
56 additional \$100. Henderson thought we should stick with the newsletter to see if  
57 there is a response and that way we would stay within our budget. Seiler asked if  
58 this was a good fit for our purposes or is it outside the norm. Rychecky asked Mr.  
59 Kemp his opinion. Kemp thought we would be better off hitting as many places as  
60 we can with the RFP if it does not require a significant amount of additional money.  
61 Orrino liked the new opportunity as it would get our information out on a credible  
62 website and the info can be shared easily. Rychecky asked how many places did  
63 Seiler's work advertise? Seiler said he works for the State of Colorado and they have  
64 to use the state website but they do alert other vendors that they think might be  
65 interested.

66

67 Brzeczek asked Hooten if the city's website connections could be used by LIFT. She  
68 said yes but it won't necessarily target the legal fields.

69

70 Rychecky moved to expand the budget for publishing the RFP from \$250 to \$350.  
71 Christensen seconded and motion passed 7/0.

72

73 Orrino offered a correction to the RFP to reflect a change that had been approved at  
74 the 7/2/2018 meeting. There should be a period after the word Colorado in line  
75 502 and the rest of the sentence deleted.

76

77 New Business

78 Seiler introduced the topic of the current application and asked the group how they  
79 wanted to approach the document and/or take a look at other URA applications.  
80 Orrino said he would like to see other UR proposals for projects. We need objectives  
81 and criteria for an approval process. There was a question as to where the current  
82 application came from. Brzeczek said it was provided by the former executive  
83 director who also served on the Colorado Springs URA who brought their forms for  
84 the LIFT board at that time to use to help create theirs.

85

86 Orrino asked what does it mean "not financially viable without the assistance of  
87 LIFT" - where does that language come from? Seiler thought that maybe elements of  
88 the project would take away the viability of it and make it less feasible for a  
89 developer so instead of putting up 500 apartments they build 100 apartments and a  
90 10-acre park. They would need our help in order to make it work financially.

91

92 Rychecky said if a developer comes in with a project for x amount of dollars on  
93 virgin site - it may be feasible for x but not for x+y. TIF would be used to make the  
94 site economical to develop. If you have multiple landowners and there is a hold out  
95 you use eminent domain. Now we're in business to partner with an entity without  
96 any interlocking financial responsibility. They take care of their end and we take  
97 care of ours. It is much easier for the developer to think we will do something  
98 because we are a public entity with a desire to develop something good. It would be  
99 nice to know up front if the developer is reasonable and will perform and be a good  
100 partner for the city. But .....

101  
102 Hopping thought it meant that what we are trying to do is leverage the developer to  
103 do a piece of the project that is a benefit to the city.

104  
105 Rychecky said our role is limited to civic improvements and to try to get single  
106 ownership and if there's a holdout a way to fairly compensate the hold out. The  
107 project will have to be approved by an election.

108  
109 Brzeczek mentioned that there are people that make a living looking at this sort of  
110 situation and we need to seek their advice when the time comes. Some were at the  
111 CDI conference she attended. Brzeczek mentioned that the previous LIFT board  
112 determined that anyone that wanted to sit down and talk with LIFT would need to  
113 pay a \$60,000 fee to help cover the expenses of hiring the consultants that would be  
114 needed by LIFT to help them with the consideration of a project. She thought the fee  
115 might need to be revisited.

116  
117 Henderson recognized the fact that we don't know what to look for in the financials  
118 as we have not been through the process before.

119  
120 Rychecky said the banks do this everyday - they will look at the developer and the  
121 project. They will drill down and there will be a credit analyst that goes to the loan  
122 committee. That's exactly what we need to replicate in a public forum so the  
123 citizens see we are being reasonable. They can build it and it not get it leased and  
124 the loan goes into default. Someone has to make a decision so we need to make a  
125 prudent one.

126  
127 Henderson asked if we had a method to reach out to the property owner to see if  
128 they have a timeline for the redevelopment of Columbine Square?

129  
130 Seiler said the previous chair did sit down with the developer about 1.5 years ago.  
131 And last year they talked with the Performing Arts Center who is looking for  
132 additional space - Town Hall is not looking to leave their current space but they  
133 want a larger space for storage etc and it appears they (the developer) are favorable  
134 for them to be part of the project. The previous proposal was high-density  
135 apartments but he didn't think anyone wants that on the site but then again it goes  
136 to the economic feasibility.

137

138 Brzeczek mentioned elements of the application that mentioned certain  
139 requirements that have not really been established by the LIFT board. She felt there  
140 were big issues that need to be resolved - objectives required without anything to  
141 back them up. Seiler thought there were elements that would be filled by the  
142 developer.

143

144 Seiler, regarding the application, said we could set up a study session and go line by  
145 line to review it. Orrino said he liked the idea of a study session and a committee  
146 that could come to the larger group to review the document.

147

148 Kemp thought the Belleview Corridor Plan should be included in our review. Seiler  
149 had already found things in the document that were problematic. Henderson  
150 thought a study session was going to be a very long meeting. Kemp said there is  
151 more homework to be done and suggested a committee formed to help guide the  
152 board as a whole. Orrino moved to establish a committee to review the application  
153 and report to the board regarding areas of improvement or change (without limiting  
154 the committee) and how to proceed to evaluate the application and adjust if  
155 necessary and to see what other URAs are doing. Henderson seconded. Rychucky  
156 urged us to seek out other URAs that are engaged in similar sized communities as  
157 Littleton. Motion passed 7/0. Seiler asked for volunteers for the new subcommittee  
158 - Rychucky, Orrino and Brzeczek volunteered.

159

160 Public Comment

161 Pam Chadbourne recalled how the Littleton Riverfront failed and said that  
162 Rychucky's points were well taken. Riverfront was built as an RFP and the URA at  
163 the time went for their second opinion as to whether or not their project would be  
164 successful but did so 4 months after the contract had been awarded. Bad bonds  
165 were issued. This is worth doing and exciting so good luck.

166

167 Brzeczek moved to adjourn at 7:15 and Henderson seconded. Motion passed 7/0.

168

169