

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

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

12 Public Comment

13 Linda Knufinke expressed her concerns about improvements on Belleview being outside
14 the boundaries of the Columbine Square Urban Renewal Plan Area.
15

16 Jeanie Erickson expressed her concern about LIFT's financial condition – could we afford
17 a bond attorney and an executive director, a new survey of conditions and any election
18 required. She heard the presentation at council's study session regarding the Belleview
19 Corridor – it was a pretty picture but there were lots of questions. Half of Belleview is in
20 Englewood. How does that impact things – will it be pretty on one side? She questioned
21 how UR money could be spent across the entire corridor.
22

23 Pam Chadbourne also saw the council study session and said it was not founded on
24 anything. It is pretty pictures – nothing more. There is no analysis that this concept
25 could work. Belleview means “beautiful view.” And what they picture is not a beautiful
26 view. She requested that some of the space be reserved and the beautiful skies, sunsets
27 and mountain views be preserved. We need to preserve the authenticity of the northern
28 part of Littleton. People like the character of the neighborhood as it is. She believes the
29 plan serves the developers and our job is to serve all of the people. PEL has been around
30 for two years – this is a manufactured crisis. The justification for this is weak – where is
31 the community buy in? Plan was developed behind the scenes as the mayor said – it is
32 for the developers and our job is to serve all the people.
33

34 Financial Report – None

35 Committee Reports

36 **ID-18-387** – Update on Attorney Search – Orrino reported that the one applicant
37 withdrew their application. After discussing with their team our needs and resources
38 did not match with theirs. If we have immediate needs they are available to us.
39

40
41 After talking to the Moye/White applicant, Orrino said he learned that a smaller firm is
42 less likely to respond to such a lengthy RFP.
43

44 Seiler proposed that we target three or four firms and solicit a more simplified package.
45 Christianson suggested we use the website to post the RFP along with a brief statement.
46

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

50
51 Hopping disapproved of money should being put into an escrow account. There are
52 methods of mutual release of the money that should be considered.

53
54 Rychecky mentioned that we have a loan agreement with the City that will need to be
55 negotiated in the near future.

56
57 Kemp saw two items for the board – the loan agreement and if city council and LIFT
58 want to talk about an IGA on Bellevue.

59
60 Rychecky said that begets the point – how far is our reach with the current increment?
61 We need independent counsel.

62
63 Seiler said no one disagrees with Rychecky – we all recognize at some point in time,
64 sooner than later, we need an attorney if we move forward with a matching grant
65 program in the area. He was not comfortable with a retainer – it can be expensive – if
66 you don't use it you lose it and that would not be in the best interests of our citizens. He
67 wanted to see what Henderson and Orrino could come up with firms that specialize in
68 this area and slim down the RFP. Ask for cost proposals and ask them their terms.

69
70 Hopping asked if there was such a thing as a letter of intent?

71
72 Brzeczek believed, from the work done on the process documents, LIFT needs an
73 attorney much sooner than later.

74
75 Seiler asked if the group supported an expedited process with possible candidates at the
76 December meeting?

77
78 Rychecky moved the search for legal representation be done by the subcommittee and
79 targeted solicitation with interviews conducted by the subcommittee and brought back
80 to the board as a whole for approval. Motion died for lack of a second.

81
82 Brzeczek moved to charge the subcommittee with reviewing the application process in
83 such a way that it will not require a lengthy process, cull through the responses and
84 determine which candidates or candidates will come before LIFT for an interview and
85 that the subcommittee target firms that specialize in urban renewal. Hopping seconded.
86 Motion passed 7/0.

87
88 **ID-18-388 – Applications Documents Report**

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

93 LIFT Regular Meeting Minutes
94 Thursday, Nov 8, 2018
95 Page 2 of 5
96

97 He pointed out the three Cs (Character, Capital and Capacity) of financing in the draft
98 document. We will need to know whom we are doing business with and who is behind
99 them – there’s a lot of footwork for someone. We have to know how all the pieces fit
100 together. Do we have the financial capacity to issue bonds and pay for them? The
101 subcommittee proposes to lower the \$60,000 fee to \$10,000 to determine how much
102 money it will cost LIFT to do the work needed. The developer will have to pay as we go.
103 And then there’s the election costs – who pays?
104

105 Brzeczek said there’s another set of processes that have to be determined as well that
106 deal more with internal processes.
107

108 Rychecky thought we needed to be searching for entities that can be gatekeepers on a
109 part-time basis for LIFT and do the preliminary work.
110

111 Brzeczek asked if it would be likely that some attorney firms might have a staff that
112 could do some of the gatekeeper functions? The answer is yes but the fees will be much
113 higher.
114

115 Hopping thought we needed an executive director or someone who knows what they are
116 doing and suggested it as a topic for a study session.
117

118 Seiler said it could be and suggested that the subcommittee might look into if there are
119 firms that do this. Having one UR area is not cost effective and the previous executive
120 director did not do the due diligence necessary for LIFT. Then Seiler suggested a study
121 session after the next meeting.
122

123 Rychecky said some municipalities use city staff but we are not in that position. This
124 will be expensive and we need to start a search not unlike the attorney search. Once we
125 have a project we will have \$10,000 to help fund the expertise needed.
126

127 Seiler asked the members to submit their comments/suggestions on the draft
128 documents to the subcommittee either prior to or at the next study session.
129

130 New Business

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

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

139 LIFT Regular Meeting Minutes
140 Thursday, Nov 8, 2018
141 Page 3 of 5
142

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

149
150 Rychecky amended the motion to add the Vice Chairman to participate in the discussion.
151 Orrino seconded. Rychecky thought LIFT should have two people that can report back –
152 not because of a lack of trust but two people absorbing the information is better than
153 one. Amendment passed 7/0. Main motion passed 6/1 with Brzeczek opposing.
154

155
156 **ID#-18-380** Discussion regarding a Study Session with Columbine Square Property
157 Owners –

158 Seiler proposed a study session with the Columbine Square property owners. He
159 proposed to work with city staff to identify the current owners and invite them to a
160 study session in January or February to start having discussions with them about their
161 challenges. What do they need to see their business thrive and move forward? We need
162 to learn their issues so we can start making decisions how we can partner with them.
163

164 Driscoll asked Jocelyn Mills if we have heard from the Columbine Square owner in the
165 last two to three months. Mills said no. He had a conversation with a limited partner
166 and had been told that there would be something by the end of the year.
167

168 Hopping thought the staff should be consulted for format of the meeting.
169

170 Brzeczek thought LIFT had some homework to do before moving forward. LIFT needs
171 to understand their financial situation before they can make any offer to any property
172 owner.
173

174 Seiler said he did not intend to make any offers. He wanted to move forward and hear
175 from property owners what they need to move forward. And then ask ourselves how
176 that fits in with what we can do legally. We may hear great ideas – we don't know what
177 they are facing.
178

179 Christenson thought small groups would be good. Seiler wants an engaging process.
180 Rychecky said he would be more comfortable if the city lead and LIFT participated.
181 Hopping thought Mills and her staff had done a good job with these types of meetings.
182

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

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

196
197 Seiler said we keep focusing on one property owner and there are many others. If they
198 come forward and we find that we are off base we can ask them what they are looking
199 for. Henderson said it sounded like interviews to him. He would like to hear about their
200 problems. Seiler said it would be nice to know what their vision is so when a proposal
201 comes forward we have more information for consideration. He wants a positive
202 discussion – it is more about listening. Christianson thought it might be beneficial for us
203 to get an idea of how we want it to happen. Brzeczek suggested that the topic be
204 brought back for the December meeting.

205
206 **ID#-18-381 Board Member Terms Discussion**

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

217
218 **Public Comment**

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

227
228 Jeanie Erickson asked what do the property owners want from UR? Did LIFT realize that
229 not one of them asked to be in the UR area - not one! However, several property owners
230 wanted out of the slum and blight area and said they didn't need the city's help.

231 LIFT Regular Meeting Minutes

232 Thursday, Nov 8, 2018

233 Page 5 of 5

234

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

239

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

245

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

250

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

254

255 She said the Centennial Square area goes to council for a rezoning in December.

256 Regarding public input – that is not required – it already took place in the process for
257 approving the plan

258

259 Hopping thought LIFT should have a briefing on the recent election outcome. Brzeczek
260 said the election issues had no bearing on LIFT. Seiler asked Kemp to provide a memo if
261 there was anything we needed to consider.

262

263 Adjourn

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