

## City of Mt. Pleasant

### Central Business District (CBD) Tax Increment Finance Authority (TIFA) Industrial Park North TIFA

-AND-

### City of Mt. Pleasant Downtown Development Board (DDB)

#### MINUTES OF THE JOINT MEETING

July 14, 2016 8:00 AM

City Hall, Conference Room A

#### I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by TIFA Board Chair Tim Driessnack at 8:04 am.

**Present (TIFA):** Tim Driessnack (Chair), Tom Krapohl, Lisa Orlando, Nancy Ridley, Rich Swindlehurst (Vice-Chair), Brad Wahr

**Absent (TIFA):** Tim Coscarelly, John Hunter, Margaret McAvoy, Rick McGuirk, Jeff Smith

**Present (DDB):** Rachel Blizzard, Peggy Bongard, Tim Brockman, Sarah Christensen (Vice-Chair), Paul Fox, Allison Quast-Lents (Chair), Rick Swindlehurst, Char Young

**Absent (DDB):** Pat Gallagher

**Also attending:** **(Staff):** Mary Ann Kornexl, William Mrdeza, Michelle Sponseller

The meeting opened with an introduction by all those present.

#### II. Approval of Agenda

It was moved by Krapohl, seconded by Brockman, to approve the agenda as presented.  
**The motion passed unanimously.**

#### III. Old and New Business

##### A. Discussion on Joint Downtown Capital Improvement Priorities

The meeting began with Mrdeza giving a brief recap of the purpose of the joint meeting and Sponseller providing an overview of the current arrangement for funding and priority setting related to downtown including:

- Current operational procedures
- Current TIFA operating obligations

- Current DDB/Special Assessment operating obligations
- General Fund operating obligations
- A listing of options available to make changes to the existing budget priorities

Kornexl followed this overview with a brief presentation which detailed the current combined sources and uses of funds dedicated to the downtown for 2016 and proposed for 2017. She also discussed the TIFA Board's priorities for capital projects over the next five years (2017-2021), noting that by the end of this five year period there would not be enough funds available in the TIFA budget to accommodate all of the current priorities. Ridley added that these priorities can be changed if the TIFA Board desires, but funds are still limited if continued maintenance of basic infrastructure (such as parking lots) is to be undertaken.

Rick Swindlehurst opened the discussion by asking for an explanation of the Banner Pole line item. Sponseller explained that the poles were purpose-built to carry the wind load of event banners that the current street light poles could not safely accommodate. He questioned why those might be a preferred (and more expensive) alternative to installing cables across the street between buildings. The cable option could save \$60,000 over the next several years (3 years at \$20,000 per year) if feasible. Swindlehurst agreed to research proposed locations of cable crossings and to work with the appropriate property owners to try to secure permission. Christensen suggested offering an incentive to those building owners who would be interested in allowing their buildings to be used for cable anchor points.

Brockman asked what items needed to be kept in the capital plan and which ones could reasonably be deferred or eliminated. This would allow the Board members to understand the degree of latitude available to them should they reprioritize the need for certain capital improvements. After some discussion, it was determined that on-going maintenance needs dictated that downtown improvements, parking lots, and alley repair needed to remain. Rick Swindlehurst also questioned the need for additional downtown lighting. He suggested a walking tour of downtown during the evening to familiarize himself and other Board members of the areas identified as needing more lighting.

Blizzard recognized the limitations of the current funding available for downtown improvements and suggested that the DDB might want to consider requesting additional General Funds be allocated to the downtown, once some priorities have been set.

Brockman opened the discussion regarding the Wayfinding line item and questioned the benefit of this effort at a cost of \$490,000, which includes the initial study and signage for downtown and the park system. Driessnack indicated that this was a low priority for him as well. After some additional discussion on Wayfinding, all members present from both Boards agreed to direct staff to convey to the City Commission that because of the limited financing available for downtown projects, Wayfinding was not a priority to them.

Committee members recapped their discussion regarding agreement on the 2017 budget related to downtown. This included:

- Change the line item for Banner Poles from \$20,000 to \$1,000
- Include downtown street lighting only if grant funds can be found to pay for it
- Defer the redevelopment of site or improvements to Parking Lot #3 (Town Center) until 2018
- Repurpose funds allocated to bike corals/bike shelters to another use to be identified
- Remove the Wayfinding line item from the budget

In closing comments, Christensen suggested that staff research other comparable communities to get some ideas regarding what they do to incent new investment in their downtown which ultimately results in growth to their tax base. Blizzard noted that the DDB Board needed to brainstorm and identify creative solutions to attract new investment into downtown as well as how to pay for identified capital priorities and other projects. Quast-Lents indicated that she has raised the question with the City Commission of combining downtown boards or adding cross-over members and will report on the outcome of those discussions at a future meeting.

#### **B. Discussion on Additional Joint Meetings to Coordinate Downtown Capital Improvement Priorities**

Mrdeza indicated that it was evident that while this was a productive start, some additional meetings between the two Boards were needed to continue the discussion and prioritize the use of available funding as well as explore additional funding options. He observed that the 8:00 am time slot appeared to work for the majority of members from both Boards and sought input regarding time of day and day of the week to focus on when scheduling the next meeting. The Board members agreed that 8:00 am was a good time, and suggested staying away from Monday or Friday meetings. Mrdeza indicated the Board members could look for another request for a meeting date in several weeks once staff had a time to research the ideas discussed and the DDB had a chance to meet and further discuss the contents of this meeting.

#### **IV. Other Business**

There was no other business proposed for consideration at this time.

#### **V. Public Comments**

There were no public comments received or offered.

#### **VI. Adjourn**

There being no other business, **the meeting adjourned at 9:14 am.**