

LIFT Regular Meeting Minutes  
Thursday, February 14, 2019

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

**Approval of the Agenda:** Chair Seiler asked for an addition to the agenda under Committee Reports, a Report on the Lawyer Selection. Jack Rychecky moved to add the agenda item and Jason Henderson seconded, Motion passed 7-0.

**Approval of the January minutes:** Chair asked for a motion to approve the regular meeting minutes of January 10, 2019. Cindy Christensen moved and Bill Hopping seconded. Motion passed 7-0.

**Public Comment:**

Pam Chadbourne started thanking board members for showing up on Valentines Day. She said that if she were on the authority, she would want to learn about Columbine Square and the use to which is put and the Belleview Corridor. Specifically, she mentioned that we have a market analysis, void analysis and gap analysis for the type of businesses that could go there by our city staff in July. She said we have the expertise here, we pay for the analysis. She would want to be learning about the uses likely to succeed at Columbine Square and the ones that might not. She's looking forward to that study session, that agenda item. The staff is right upstairs and would be eager to talk to the board. She recognizes that the Belleview Corridor vision was done which shows a huge infill project there. I realize the role of the city; this board is not to respond to market forces. We should be looking at 3 to 4 market cycles. 20 or 30 years. Cities don't respond to market cycles. Markets respond to market cycles. If we respond to market forces, we lose everything and that's what happens to mediocre cities. That is what happened in the past.

**Financial Report:** Since Tiffany Hooten was not present Jack Rychecky moved and Brzeczek seconded a motion to table the January financial report to the March meeting. Motion approved 7-0.

**Committee Reports:**

**Application Document review**

Jack Rychecky opened the topic by saying he and Carol Brzeczek had met and had received comments from other board members. He said most of them had to do with the syntax and format and went through to clean up the entire document. Carol added that the document has been worked and reworked and reworked. This should be made a draft until our attorney can go over it and he or she can tell us where it may be difficult. Chair Seiler and Board member Hopping started the board members comments by saying that while this is a complete document it could be intimidating for potential applicants to see initially. Perhaps there could be a simpler way to start the process and then move forward into the more detailed one. There could be steps developers go through before they get into a more detailed application. Is that

1 an informal meeting with the board members, the chair or a board member? Seiler mentioned  
2 the procedural details could be determined by the board. If the developer does believe he or  
3 she needs rezoning do they come directly to the LIFT board or do they go through the City  
4 process first? That may be a question that the board can talk to the City Council about at the  
5 upcoming Council/LIFT board meeting. Hopping mentioned this may also be something we can  
6 incorporate into this process or put some direction on the web site. The process does need  
7 some flexibility on where the developer goes first. For instance, if the project just needs  
8 financing it may come directly to the LIFT board. If it needs rezoning or design guidelines it may  
9 go through the City process first. The LIFT Board and Council will need to be in communication  
10 about these processes and potential projects. Carol mentioned that part of the process may  
11 need to include the City's planning process. Cindy Christensen mentioned that this is where  
12 Jack's initial charts of the processes come in, basically if it needs this it goes one place, if it  
13 doesn't it goes here, for example. Jason Henderson said the next step may be for Rychecky to  
14 go back and come up with an initial step that would be an informal conversation or meeting  
15 with the LIFT board chair or designee. Seiler mentioned that getting our attorney to look at the  
16 application packet as proposed, talking with city council about our process will be next steps.  
17 The board also thanks Jack and Carol for preparing the documents as it helps with our  
18 understanding. He suggested that we table any further discussion to the April meeting, and  
19 then in May and June incorporate the comments from Council and the attorney if on board by  
20 then.

#### 21 22 **Lawyer decision:**

23 Kevin turned this item over to Joseph Orrino for an update. Joseph reported that Douglas  
24 Widlund, the second attorney to be interviewed, took on a large project and withdrew from the  
25 process. He added that in talking with Mr. Widlund the attorney did mention that his practice  
26 deals more with litigation than in transactions. He did say the first firm that we met with is  
27 suited to what we need. He said that the Widlund firm had lower costs because Douglas  
28 Widlund is a sole practitioner. Joseph asked board members for comments. Jack Rychecky said  
29 he has looked at both web sites and does think both could do the work we need. Since this item  
30 was added this evening the board could not take any action. Seiler said he would like to let  
31 Joseph work with Henry Rodriguez to come up with a proposal for the board to act on next  
32 month.

#### 33 34 **New Business:**

35 **Recording Secretary discussion:** Rychecky brought this up as an agenda item. He said he really  
36 appreciates all that Brzeczek has done over the last months and years in taking minutes, but he  
37 believes we need to hire or appoint a recording secretary that is not a board member. It is very  
38 difficult for a board member to take minutes and participate in the discussions at the same  
39 time. He said the easiest thing may be to talk to the City to see about hiring someone to be a  
40 recording secretary. Cindy Christensen agreed saying that because every meeting is recorded,  
41 and the video recording link is listed in Minutes on the web site. Brzeczek had another opinion  
42 saying she has had to research minutes from previous meetings, and it was much easier to find  
43 them and to read through the printed minutes. She said not everyone has the technical  
44 expertise to pull up the minutes. By reading the Minutes you can find out exactly what was

1 accomplished in the meetings and who accomplished it. Seiler said that the bylaws simply say  
2 that the LIFT board will appoint a recording secretary. He said no matter who records the  
3 written minutes it can sometimes be flavored one way or another. He also said that the other  
4 boards do not use written minutes. This would bring us in line with the other boards and the  
5 City Council. Orrino said that the Minutes are good to go back and understand the Why of the  
6 action. Seiler said he would be willing to inquire at the City to see if there is a good person to be  
7 a recording secretary.

8  
9 **Public Comment:**

10 Jeannie Erickson, District 1: The owners of Columbine Square own other properties in Colorado.  
11 Just wanted you to know that. It's their job to know urban renewal not our job to teach it to  
12 them. I totally agree with hiring a recording secretary. It should not be a board member. Board  
13 members do need to participate. Recordings can be very cumbersome. The Nays, Yays and  
14 Whys should be in print. Another thing that happened tonight that got me thinking. I would  
15 hate to see this board used as a back doorway for a developer that doesn't really need gap  
16 financing to get the zoning, they want especially losing retail to apartments. Listening to  
17 comments tonight makes me believe this could be a real possibility because they may not get  
18 the zoning, they want through the planning commission or the City Council. Please be aware  
19 and be cautious for us citizens. Thank you for your service.

20  
21 Pam Chadbourne: I'm going to make a comment about minutes. The decision by Council to go  
22 to action minutes was wrong. The vote was 4-3 and it should not have been made. Video is not  
23 a good record and it is so cumbersome for everyone to access. You have to listen to hours, to  
24 jump back and forth and it is not one hundred percent accurate. My suggestion is to get  
25 transcription software and make transcripts. It should have done that four years ago. You can't  
26 be accused of bias. It's searchable. You can skim the document. If you want to look at one  
27 member's comments you can do that. You can't do that in a video. The City needs to get  
28 transcription software. So maybe you can move them in that direction. You can get a transcript  
29 of the discussion. I'm alarmed about the process discussion. Let me say a few things. The  
30 Belleview Corridor Plan is not the guiding document until the comp plan is complete. The  
31 current comp plan is the legal document. I am disturbed greatly by City Council, Planning  
32 Commission and others saying oh there's no document now. We can disregard our old plan  
33 because it's old. And this is wrong. We have a comp plan and we must respect it, and that is it.  
34 The second thing about the process is consider cases and this is the way that things are  
35 developed like this. You need to find out the value of your process and primarily I think that's  
36 to prevent failure by all parties. You want to achieve a viable process that is a win win win.  
37 Thirdly you may want to have a process that is easy for applicants, but I think that is way down  
38 there. When you do cases I want you to consider what if the developer is wrong. That's what  
39 happened with Riverfront Authority. The thing they provided wasn't supported by the market.  
40 What if the City is wrong for money or the scope of the project? You want a process that  
41 catches those cases. So, you talk though. In this case does the process catch it. I don't  
42 understand the uncertainty here. There are limits as to what the City can do with urban  
43 renewal. I'm sure there are experts out there who would say, Littleton this is too big for you to  
44 chew. You've already said you have 20 years left. That limits our options. We'd like to see the

1 boundaries. What we can do I would like to see the boundaries, what we can do and what we  
2 can't. I'm sure we can hire an expert who can at least give us the boundaries. I would like to  
3 know that and am sure all of us would like to know that.

4

5 Brzeczek moved to adjourn, seconded by Henderson, Motion passed 7-0.

6

DRAFT