

MINUTES OF A CONTINUED MEETING OF THE CITY  
COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF COEUR D'ALENE, IDAHO, AND WORKSHOP WITH  
IGNITE CDA,  
HELD AT NORTH IDAHO COLLEGE, IN THE LAKE COEUR D'ALENE ROOM  
April 26, 2018

The Mayor and Council of the City of Coeur d'Alene met in a continued session of said Council in a workshop with the ignite cda board at the North Idaho College Lake Coeur d'Alene Room April 26, 2018 at 5:00 P.M., there being present upon roll call the following members:

Steve Widmyer, Mayor

Dan Gookin ) Members of Council Present  
Kiki Miller )  
Dan English )  
Woody McEvers )  
Loren Ron Edinger )  
Amy Evans )

**MEMBERS OF EXECUTIVE TEAM PRESENT:** Troy Tymesen, City Administrator; Mike Gridley City Attorney; Chris Bosley, City Engineer; Renata McLeod, Municipal Services Director, and Hilary Anderson, Community Planning Director.

**ignite cda BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:** Scott Hoskins, Chairman, and Board members Mic Armon, Brad Jordan, James Chapkis, Alivia Metts, Sarah Garcia, Steve Widmyer and Dan English. Legal Counsel Danielle Quade and Executive Director Tony Berns were also present.

**CALL TO ORDER:** Mayor Widmyer called the meeting to order. Chairman Hoskins called the ignite cda meeting to order and conducted a silent roll call.

**ATLAS WATERFRONT SITE - Mayor** Widmyer noted that the meeting objective is to have the project team present a description of the project objective, community input process, and how the land use/site development may occur to achieve the public space and economic balance objectives for the site.

Welch Comer President Phil Boyd noted that the project team included himself and Taylor Tompke with Welch Comer Engineers, Matt Anderson and Amy Hartman with Heartland Real-estate Advisors, Mark Sindell and Don Vehige with GGLO Design and Dell Hatch with BWA Landscape Architects. The project objective was to preserve the waterfront as public space, balance the public and private funding, and create a unique addition to the community that reflects the community values. He noted that they had three large community meetings wherein they solicited input that was used to develop the proposal presented this evening. Some highlights of the public inputs include more bike and pedestrian access, and more public waterfront space even if it requires higher development density. Some of the amenities that were preferred included outdoor waterfront dining, swimming and beach areas, as well as non-

motorized watercraft launch sites. The public input also demonstrated a desire to have developed waterfront shoreline rather than natural shoreline protection.

**LAND USE PLANNING CONCEPT/SITE DESIGN-** Mark Sindell and Don Vehige with GGLO Design presented a site plan design concept incorporating existing trail connections and engagement with Riverstone. Mr. Vehige noted that they envision great street connections and view corridors that are unobstructed to the water. He noted the type of development along the riverfront street is proposed to include town homes, with alley access and parking. He noted additional options for single-family development at the northwest side of the site. Mr. Sindell noted that it is important to create a compact walkable development with an easy to use trail system, commercial development that has outdoor space, and open space along the river. This is intended to pull people into the street ends that may include additional open space and/or river access. He noted that they envision a rim trail along the hillside of the development that wraps through the residential housing area.

**PUBLIC SPACE CONCEPTS -** Dell Hatch with BWA Architects reviewed the site plan open space/public spaces to include the potential of sports areas at the “Mount Hink” site. Some of the ideas to assist with public access may include an overlook site, public art, seating areas, and fishing docks. As public areas get closer to commercial space it could include a transient (short-term parking) boat dock area, stone terracing, a re-creation of the old mill pond area and swim area. Additional options along the waterfront include a dog swim area and additional trails. Mr. Hatch reviewed the option of sports fields at the “Mount Hink” site, which he noted did not get favorable public input at last night’s public meeting. He noted that this type of use was proposed due to the restrictive soil issues for other type of developments. . Additional discussions with the planning team netted an idea for a network of trails with natural grasses and flowers and a connection to the Prairie Trail at the “Mount Hink” location.

**REAL-ESTATE REQUIREMENTS TO ACHIEVE PUBLIC SPACE-** Matt Anderson and Amy Hartman with Heartland Real-Estate Consultants noted that they were engaged to serve two roles. The first role was to stand in place for the development community builders/investors, which means to express their needs/wants. The second role was to review the risk to the public agencies and developers. Mr. Anderson reviewed the economic analysis that was conducted for the project. Ms. Hartman explained the methodology of how they established the value for each block within the development. She noted that developers would first determine what type of investment is desirable and then establish what they could sell a product for, which aided in coming up with the value for each site. They focused mostly on residential for the site with limited commercial uses, as there are already established commercial and office uses in the vicinity. She noted the square footage estimates and the price that would be reasonable to assume for each type of use. She noted that condominium use requires more square footage due to parking requirements, so they are less profitable than the townhomes, but they wanted to propose diversity within the development. Ms. Hartman demonstrated the absorption rate for the mixed-use proposal versus single-family units and noted that there were approximately 400 units proposed within 4 phases of development. Mr. Anderson noted that they do not have a financing plan at this point; however, they have determined that the development portion pencils out. They just need to determine how to finance the public open space/parkland portion. He explained that Phase 1 is the most difficult financially, as there are upfront investments in infrastructure that are

required with a need to ensure the City recoups those funds. The next step will be to work on the financing plan for the upfront costs. Mr. Anderson described the site plan phased development, again noting that Phase 1 is the largest and most expensive phase, due to infrastructure. Mr. Boyd explained the technical code requirements that must be included in Phase 1, such as roadways, irrigation lines, trails, etc. He noted that they are seeking some input from the City Council and the ignite Board to determine if they are on the right track and to direct them to keep refining the numbers. Mr. Boyd noted that there is an abutting triangle piece in the middle of the site and would advise that it is potentially valuable to acquire to complete the space.

**DISCUSSION-** Councilmember McEvers asked for clarification on the development value. Mr. Anderson noted that value would be for the builder as a value of the finished pad. Mayor Widmyer noted that there should be simultaneous public and private improvements to encourage development. Boardmember Armon asked how many units are included in Phase 1. Mr. Anderson noted that they are proposing 59 single-family, 90 multi-family, 149 condominium, and 122 townhome units, which totals 419 units in total with one small commercial neighborhood restaurant. Councilmember English felt that the docks would be valuable as day use docks, and he would support the docks and a dog water access park. Councilmember Gookin asked for clarification as to the method used to determine the pricing. Mr. Anderson explained that they used the residual land value, which is a way to back into the value through use of total land value and comparable sales. He noted that he was conservative with values, so that they do not miss the land value forecasts. Councilmember Gookin asked how to come up with ratio of commercial versus residential uses. Mr. Anderson felt that too much retail would be a big concern with Riverstone being so close. In regard to residential development, they used the geography of the site and the ability to divide it into the four phases. Councilmember McEvers noted that Riverstone was planned to be one type of development then plans kept changing due to economics. He expressed concern that there is not enough commercial in the proposal. Ignite Executive Director Tony Berns explained that the consultant team is presenting a proposal for what they determined would produce the most land value and finance for the debt of the infrastructure.

Councilmember Evans asked if the triangle piece referenced is valuable as residential space. Mr. Boyd noted that the initial review was to propose townhomes within that space as it would be valuable as a revenue stream. Mr. Vehige felt that the potential connection of the rim trail and a street connection would make the development more complete. Mr. Anderson noted that the triangle piece has two things that are enticing, the Seltice Way frontage for commercial, and a prominent view along the southern edge which is good for residential. City Attorney Mike Gridley noted that one of the reasons the City has been looking at the piece is to connect/extend a riverfront trail. Councilmember Evans asked if there was consideration of a school site due to the additional residential units proposed. Mr. Boyd explained that they have not had much discussion regarding the site, but noted that the School District would need to purchase the land.

Councilmember Miller asked how the timing works for moving forward with annexation and zoning. Mr. Boyd explained that the city would be the developer of the mixed use and would set the design standards and density. Ignite could assist in the process and with building the infrastructure. Mr. Anderson noted that there should be a balance of flexibility to allow for market changes such as the use of townhouses versus something similar in design, density,

heights, and parking while still maintaining the cohesiveness of the development. Community Planning Director Hilary Anderson clarified that the annexation process would need to be completed and the zoning set based on the proposed uses, and standards could be set through the annexation agreement including a Planned Unit Development (PUD) with attached site plan. She noted that they could move forward with annexation at this stage or later, as the PUD could lock in the site plan. Mr. Berns noted that annexation would need to occur prior to the City Council approval of expansion and/or creation of urban renewal districts.

Councilmember English noted that as part of the funding plan he would support moving forward with a G.O. Bond, as he believes the public would get excited about all the improvements included in the first phase. Mr. Boyd noted that they would anticipate presenting the funding options to the Council that would include an option with or without a bond. Councilmember McEvers asked if the City or ignite has done this type of development before. City Administrator Troy Tymesen clarified that the City has not been the developer like this before, nor has ignite. Mayor Widmyer clarified that the City would not subdivide/plat the lots, rather they would sell blocks of land to developers and they would formally subdivide. Mr. Boyd confirmed that a developer may buy an area of land or could buy the land in its entirety; however, the developer would be required to maintain the character of the PUD. Boardmember Metts thanked the planning team and asked what they estimate the current infrastructure and public improvement costs are. Ms. Hartman noted that the ballpark estimate for Phase 1 is \$11 Million for infrastructure such as roads and grading of the site and \$5 Million in park improvements. Boardmember Jordan said that this process is new to the community; however, it is not unheard of by other urban renewal agencies. He wondered what could be done to speed up the development of the waterfront park as he does not want to see it take 10 years and believes that the majority of the citizens would buy into a bond initiative. Councilmember Edinger asked how much money ignite would be putting toward the project and noted that the Council has not discussed a bond election. Mayor Widmyer noted that ignite is willing to partner with the City and that is part of the financial feasibility study. The team is currently asking that the Council and ignite Board look at the concept, and then would move forward with financial analysis. Ignite could then determine what they could bring to the project and if more funds are needed the Council could discuss other options. Councilmember Gookin noted that he likes the concept, is concerned about the funding, and would favor a bond. He expressed concern for the urban renewal agency being stuck with dirt that is not developed. Boardmember Armon noted that the risk is concerning to ignite as well, which is why they are trying to find out how much risk there is and get comfortable with absorption. Mayor Widmyer noted that the planning team was tasked to bring forward a unique type of development, and has agreed to continue to study the market. Boardmember Hoskins noted that the Kendall Yards development has a nice community feel and they love the town homes. Boardmember Jordan noted that if they can ramp up the time for the waterfront development, it would make it easier to sell the land. Mr. Anderson noted that the City would be able to determine if town house, cottage, and etc. would be better placed, depending on the price. Mayor Widmyer noted that condominium projects have not been popular in the past; however, the proposal for this area would be smaller condominium developments. Councilmember Miller asked how the annexation agreement would be worded to provide the City the flexibility needed, while still assuring the community input regarding height and density and security of the parkland/open space. Ms. Anderson noted that staff could draft proposed language and make sure that there is maximum heights/density

included in the agreement. Mayor Widmyer noted that the building envelopes on the Park Drive lots might work for this project. Mr. Gridley clarified that the City is the party taking title and if conveyed to ignite, there can be deed restrictions as the Council ultimately controls the process. Councilmember McEvers expressed concern regarding the amount of parking within the entire development. Mr. Vehige explained that the concept includes narrow streets as traffic calming methods and did not want to include on-street parking on the water side; however, they will look at overall street parking throughout. He clarified that the concept was to create a unique space that would encourage walkability with its connected pathways and design. Mayor Widmyer noted that the timeframe for the financial feasibility study to be presented is mid-June.

**MOTION:** Motion by Gookin, seconded by McEvers to approve the proposed site development concept and park space size/development character and to move forward with refining the financial feasibility as presented and to confirm the annexation of the Bad Axe property. **Motion carried.**

**Ignite MOTION:** Motion by Armon, seconded by Metts to approve the proposed site development concept and park space size/development character and to move forward with refining the financial feasibility as presented. **Motion carried.**

**DISCUSSION:** The Mayor thanked Mr. Boyd and Dell Hatch and their team for working on this project.

**ADJOURN:** Motion by McEvers, seconded by Edinger that there being no further business, this meeting of the City Council be adjourned. **Motion carried.**

**Ignite MOTION TO ADJOURN:** Motion by Garcia, seconded by Jordan that there being no further business, this meeting of the ignite cda board be adjourned. **Motion carried.**

The meeting adjourned at 7:17 p.m.

---

Steve Widmyer, Mayor

ATTEST:

---

Renata McLeod, City Clerk