January 9, 2024

THE URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY BOARD OF THE CITY OF LEWISTON, IDAHO, met in a regular meeting Tuesday, January 9, 2024, at Lewiston City Hall. Chairperson Sheila Bond called the meeting to order at 12:00 p.m.

I. CALL TO ORDER

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Sheila Bond, Chairperson; Don Beck; Joe Gish; Jim Kleeburg; A.L. "Butch" Alford; Tim Switzer

BOARD MEMBERS EXCUSED: Joe Anderson, Vice Chairperson

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: Shannon Grow, URA Director; Katie Hollingshead, Assistant URA Director; Aaron Butler, IT; Luke Antonich, City Engineer; Aimee Gordon, City Treasurer, Dan Johnson, Mayor

OTHERS PRESENT: Thad O'Sullivan, URA Legal Counsel

II. ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR FOR 2024

Chairperson Bond asked for nominations for Chairperson for the 2024 year. Board member Alford nominated Sheila Bond. Board member Gish provided the second. Sheila Bond accepts the nomination. There were no other nominations. Motion passed 6-0.

Chairperson Bond asked for nominations for Vice Chairperson for the 2024 year. Chairperson Bond nominated Joe Gish for Vice Chairperson. Board member Switzer provided the second. Joe Gish accepts the nomination. There were no other nominations. Motion passed 6-0.

III. CITIZEN COMMENTS

None.

IV. CORRECTIONS OR ADDITIONS TO AGENDA

Director Grow asked that the review of the financial summary be removed as the bank statement has not yet been processed and the financial summary created for December.

V. ACTIVE AGENDA (ACTIVE ITEM)

A. Approval of Minutes, December 12, 2023 – Action Item

B. Approval of Invoices

1. O'Sullivan Law, December 2023 Legal Services, $1007.00

Board member's Alford and Switzer moved and seconded, respectively, to approve the minutes and invoice from O'Sullivan Law.

Board member Gish asked if the board could discuss the breakdown of the legal service fees. Director Grow pulled up the invoice that was provided in the meeting packet. Board member Alford asked how the relationship with O'Sullivan Law was going. Director Grow stated that she felt it was going good, and that she had had a meeting with Mr. O'Sullivan to discuss the Main/East Main revenue allocation area and that there was good, open communication. Board member Alford asked if Mr. O'Sullivan would be able to attend a meeting in person in the coming months and both Director Grow and Mr. O'Sullivan answered affirmatively. Chairperson Bond called for the vote. Motion passed 6-0.

VI. UNFINISHED AND NEW BUISNESS

A. Main/East Main RAA #4:

Director Grow stated that following the December meeting, she had met with Mr. O'Sullivan and Megan from Elam & Burke to discuss what options were available to the board.

Option 1 is to do nothing:

- either keep the revenue allocation area open and pursue other projects in the plan or close the revenue allocation area.

Option 2 is to pursue a partnership with the developer:

- Plan amendment is not recommended
- Close the Revenue Allocation Area or de-annex the subject property from the existing Revenue Allocation Area
- Establish a new Revenue Allocation Area and create a new plan
    - An eligibility study is recommended to help determine the needs and opportunities for the area and would address housing, utility and road infrastructure needs and how those needs fit into the URA's mission and goals. This study can be done concurrently with the termination of the existing RAA or de-annexation process of the subject property from the existing RAA. An eligibility study typically costs between $5,000 and $10,000 and can be funded by the URA using surplus funds from another RAA (to be paid back once a new RAA is formed), by the City, or by the Developer.

Create a Participation Agreement with the Developer

Developer identifies costs and submits documentation to determine reasonableness of expenses.

URA reimburses developer for costs after accepted by the City.

URA can put strings on development.

Typically, there is a "do not exceed" amount, that is paid over the term of the district.

Board member Gish asked if pursuing Option 2 would be considered favoritism and would it be setting a precedent where the URA would have to partner with any/all developers. Director Grow said that the URA would review each potential project separately as it was presented by a developer to make sure that it fits the mission and goals of the URA and the applicable Revenue Allocation Area. The URA doesn't have control over who approaches the board with a project but does have control over deciding if a project fits within the mission and goals of the organization.

Mr. O'Sullivan also provided that the proposed development would be beneficial to the surrounding area and not just to the developer's property.

Director Grow stated that she can ask the developer if they have interest in pursuing multifamily development as part of the project and that could tell the board if they want to move forward with partnering on a project with them. Director Grow stated that she could also look for similar projects that other URA's in Idaho have done and what eligibility studies contained for those projects and bring that information back to the board to help provide more information for them to consider when making this decision.

Chairperson Bond asked how long an eligibility study would take. Director Grow stated that she thinks it would take around six (6) months to complete. Board member Alford asked if he was correct in remembering that the project was for water lines and road construction. Director Grow stated yes. The subject property is located between two water zones and the City would be interested in being a partner to determine which of those water zones would be able to ultimately provide additional water service to the subject property. Chairperson Bond asked what happens if the eligibility study comes back and the board decides not to create a new Revenue Allocation Area, what happens. Director Grow stated that a situation like that is definitely an argument against borrowing money from another RAA and to instead ask the developer to front the cost of the study and to include the reimbursement in the development agreement.

Board member Beck asked how long it would take to close down the existing RAA and to open up a new RAA. Director Grow stated it is about 3 months to close one down but a year or so to open a new revenue allocation area and create a plan.

B. Downtown RAA #7 - Director Grow stated there was no update. Board member Gish asked if it was known when an update would be provided. Director Grow stated no, she is still waiting for information to be provided to her.

C. East Orchards Sewer #5 –

Assistant Director Hollingshead shared that she had received contract amendments for the completion of Segment 7 design and the proposal for the rock boring study and that she and Director Grow had met with Joe Kaufman, Engineering Supervisor, and had made some minor changes to go back to the contractor. The expectation is that those amendments would be on the February agenda for approval.

D. Board Member Comments -

Vice Chair Gish stated that he still planned on creating the graph for the East Orchards Sewer project and would be contacting Assistant Director Hollingshead to get the information needed to complete.

E. Staff Comments

Director Grow let the board know that the paperwork to join the State Treasurer's pool has been submitted and that the January financial summary should reflect the sweep of funds to the pool.

Assistant Director Hollingshead asked for rsvp's for board members planning on attending the volunteer appreciation reception that would be held on February 2, 2024.

VII. <u>ADJOURN (ACTION ITEM)</u>

There being no further business, Board members Alford and Beck moved and seconded, respectively, to adjourn. The motion carried 6-0 and the Urban Renewal Agency Board adjourned at approximately 12:45 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED, ATTEST:

Katie Hollingshead

KATIE HOLLINGSHEAD,
RECORDING SECRETARY

Sheila Bond

URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY CHAIR

Approved this 13 day of February, 2024.