City of Woodland Park
Downtown Development Authority

November 5, 2024, at 7:30 AM

AGENDA

1. **CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**
2. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
3. **ADDITIONS, DELETIONS OR CORRECTIONS TO AGENDA**
4. **CONSENT AGENDA**
   a. Minutes October 1, 2024
5. **PUBLIC COMMENT ON ITEMS NOT ON AGENDA**
6. **UNFINISHED BUSINESS (**Public Comment may be heard**) None**
7. **NEW BUSINESS**
   a. TAVA update **(Waggoner/Weaver)**
   b. Micro Grants **(Gemelke)**
8. **PUBLIC COMMENT REGARDING NEW BUSINESS None**
9. **REPORTS**
   a. Board Chair Report
   b. Treasurer Report
   c. Board Member Reports
   d. City Attorney's Report
10. **ADJO URNMENT**

Woodland Park Downtown Development Authority Board of Directors

Tuesday, October 1st, 2024, 7:30 a.m.

City Hall-Council Chambers 220 South Avenue, Woodland Park, CO

Regular Meeting

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL
   CALL TO ORDER AT 7:30 A.M. BY CHAIR GEMELKE

   PRESENT: Jon Gemelke
   Arden Weatherford
   Tony Perry
   David Mijares
   Eric Cabrerra
   Jerry Good
   Al Born

   ABSENT: George Jones

   STAFF: Aaron Vassalotti, City Manager

   GUESTS: Mark Weaver

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

   All attendees participated.

3. ADDITIONS, DELETIONS OR CORRECTIONS TO AGENDA

   None

4. CONSENT AGENDA

   Motion:

   Mr. Perry moved to approve the minutes of September 10th, 2024, as presented.

   2nd:

   Mr. Born seconds.

   VOTE:

   Voice roll call vote, motion was approved unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT ON ITEMS NOT ON AGENDA

None

6. UNFINISHED BUSINESS (Public Comment may be heard)

None

7. NEW BUSINESS

a. TAVA Update

Mr. Weaver thanked members of the board for attending the groundbreaking. They are wrapping up the Subdivision Development Agreement in signature execution. They are waiting on the completion bond that is required for the financial assurances. He hopes to hear about that this week. There will be continued work on the site. He believes they will be open next summer.

Chair Gemelke questioned when they would start work on the foundation.

Mr. Weaver responded that their goal is within the next 30 days. He received clarification on Bergstrom Park in that the land is owned by the city, the building is owned by the Historical Society and the property is within the DDA boundary.

b. Bergstrom Park

Mr. Weatherford considered paving the hardware store lot for extra parking for Bergstrom Park. He also suggested the rear section of the Vectra parking lot, over which the city holds a 99-year easement. Clean up and signage for that lot would be beneficial. He does not believe the DDA specifically needs a consultant to get what we need but he also recognizes that the DDA is not the one implementing the changes. He requests that Mr. Vassalotti explain his reasoning for wanting a consultant.

Mr. Vassalotti believes a consultant would be beneficial for community engagement. They have far better mechanisms in order to efficiently reach the public. He also believes a consultant would be beneficial in productivity. The DDA expressed concern about the timeline of this project and a consultant would help mitigate that. Consultants also bring experts in concept engineering and design. In response to Mr. Mijares' question, the Parks & Recreation Advisory Board would take lead on this project with the DDA and the Historical Preservation Committee being key partners in it.

Mr. Mijares sees this area as not only the park but a centerpiece of the downtown area that can also help the parking situation. He would like to get Ms. Schminke involved from a planning standpoint.

Mr. Perry noted that he typically is against the use of consultants however, how the city has used them recently he would not be averse to this approach. Mr. Vassalotti concurred that a high-end budget for this project would be $40,000 - $50,000.

Motion:

Mr. Perry moved to approve a grant to the City of Woodland Park for one half of the Consulting Engagement, up to $25,000.

2nd:

Mr. Born seconds.

Chair Gemelke questioned if the DDA could go to the consultant with requests or ideas.

Mr. Vassallotti explained that the DDA could suggest ideas or requests to the consultant. During the Meadow Wood project there were two open town hall meetings where the public could come and give feedback. The consultants also had direct engagement with the boards involved.

VOTE:

Voice roll call vote, motion was approved unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

c. Vos/Martini Hut Building

Mr. Perry has had many conversations with Mr. Nguyen. He spoke with him a month and a half ago desiring to let us walk in the building and see what they are thinking in terms of improvements and moving forward. He has left multiple messages with a common theme of change. We have given plenty of time for them to communicate. It is now known that a realtor was showing the building yesterday. Mr. Perry recommends that the DDA support the city in a condemnation process. He noted that because the building has been vacant for two years they may be eligible for Enterprise Zone tax credits, but they must apply prior to any construction to the building. He also would encourage them to meet with the city to determine what needs to be fixed in anticipation of many code violations. He recommends that if the DDA move forward in supporting the condemnation process, the city should allow the building owner time until the last possible moment to make corrections and find solutions. The DDA paid and did the work to keep the weeds down outside of ownership last year and there has been no proactiveness seen from the owner since then. Mr. Perry hopes this will encourage them to take action.

Mr. Born questioned if a condemnation declaration is obtained what the next steps would be.

Mr. Perry noted when he did his research several years ago, it is an intensive process which is intended to give the property owner an opportunity to resolve the issues. It involves getting an appraisal and the city would have to pay fair value. He suspects they will have a hard time getting their initial purchase price back because they let the building deteriorate so much.

Mr. Born questioned if the condemnation process is granted would that allow the city to potentially destroy the building and give the dirt back to the current owner.

Mr. Perry noted that Mr. Vassalotti would need to look into that. His perspective is that the city would need to buy the property, which the DDA could potentially participate in. There are grants that could possibly help in the demolition of the building. There are many individuals who want to save the building, the problem is the money it would take to fix it. Mr. Perry does not believe any building could go there because of the extensive code requirements it currently does not meet. He reminded the board that the DDA has no authority to condemn the building, he is only suggesting we support the city in that effort if they so choose.

Mr. Weatherford questioned what the process of condemning a building would entail. If it would need to go to council or if city staff and/or the city attorney could handle it.

Mr. Vassalotti explained he would need to do some research on this process. He is currently unaware of a previous instance the city has engaged in this process.

Mr. Perry is only suggesting that we offer support to the city if they choose this process. This gives the city manager license to go through whatever he needs to do to explore this. The DDA is very motivated to solve their problem, and they do not seem as motivated as we are.

Mr. Weatherford agreed that implementing a deadline ensures progress will be made. He suggests that we appoint two members from this board to meet with the city in representation of the DDA to observe how this process could start.

Mr. Mijares questioned if this had been discussed at council or if there was an appetite for this type of progress.

Mr. Vassalotti noted council has been looking into grants however there has been no consensus or direction on this issue. He will gather information to determine how to best proceed with this issue.

Chair Gemelke recognizes that we cannot rush this process. It is a serious undertaking that the city could take on. He does understand that the frustration of wanting to move forward with this issue.

Mr. Perry noted that there is nothing the DDA could do to start or push this process other than to provide our support. Ultimately the city has to engage the process.

Motion:

Mr. Perry motioned to support the city, if they so choose, to start the condemnation process on the building formerly known as the Vos/Martini Hut Building.

2nd:

Mr. Born seconds.

Mr. Good believes we are going down a path we shouldn't be on. They have their property rights and we should not be encroaching on that. There are many other buildings that need drastic improvements.

Chair Gemelke countered that it is a poor looking building. Even if some exterior cosmetic improvements were made until a bigger renovation could take place would benefit the community. He agreed that they have property rights however in the state the building is in there needs to be a change.

Mr. Good countered that he does not have an issue with the building. It is not worth taking someone's property away from them.

Mr. Weatherford argued that the property owners would be paid what the building is worth. He agreed there are other buildings around town that need improvements however this building is in the center of downtown, it is seen everyday, and it is definitely one of the worst buildings in town. In two years they have made no improvements.

Mr. Perry noted members of the community have done a lot of work to that building over the years and the owners have done nothing. He agreed with Mr. Good about property rights but there comes a point where they need to step up and do their part. The building is deteriorating severely and needs to be addressed. This board, as part of a quasi-governmental entity of the city is supporting the city if they choose to proceed with condemnation. Mr. Perry hopes the owners see this in the paper and choose to reach out to the city about what they can do to make improvements. If the building were to be demolished, he suspects anything else that tries to occupy that space would legally have a hard time due to current city code. All we are doing is giving our support to the city showing that we have done our best to help these parties and they have been unresponsive.

Mr. Good questioned if the building has certain grandfathered rights to it, if someone renovated it and used it for a like use, not everything needs to be brought up to the current code.

Mr. Perry noted that he has had multiple general contractors view the exterior and he believes the amount of work necessary to rehab the building would violate current code even if it were like use.

Mr. Weatherford added that in order for grandfathered use to apply the building must be maintained and operated. He believes this building would have lost its grandfathered use because it has not been maintained over the years.

Mr. Born noted that from his knowledge on DDA's and URA's, condemnation is one of the tools that they have to help cause and move forward the dissolution of blight. Other communities have used it in order to push certain developments.

Mr. Perry reminded that it is not one of our tools unlike other DDA's in the country. It is a part of our Charter to fight against blight and support the city in a condemnation process.

VOTE:

Mr. Born – Yes
Mr. Cabrera – Yes

Chair Gemelke – Yes
Mr. Good – No
Mr. Mijares – Yes
Mr. Perry – Yes
Mr. Weatherford – Yes

Motion passes 6-1.

d. Micro Grants

Chair Gemelke hoped to discuss the Micro Grant application and put together a form that could be presented for approval at the next meeting.

Mr. Perry stated that Park State Bank would not apply for a micro grant, but he would be willing to collate everyone's ideas and help come up with a construct for the grants.

Mr. Born added that he would also be willing to look at this process and see if it's productive for the community.

Mr. Good requested that if a board member has a business that they not apply for the grant.

Chair Gemelke suggested that if a board member's business wants to apply, they should recuse themselves from a vote. He does not believe the DDA members should be penalized for being DDA members and business owners. All businesses within the DDA boundary should be allowed to apply whether they are a member or not.

Mr. Good noted issues in the past regarding TIF funding for board members and for the sake of appearance it would be best if board members did not participate.

Mr. Perry countered that each member is a building or business owner within the DDA district. It is unrealistic to suggest a board member not participate in a product that impacts their business or building. He acknowledged Mr. Good's argument from an appearance perspective but argued that in the past there were not the appropriate recusal expectations that we have now. It is unreasonable to expect none of us to do business in the district because we sit on this board. That is not a conflict of interest. We solve the appearance issue by having clear guidance and keeping everything visible to the public. Park State Bank will not be participating in this grant which is why he volunteered to set up the construct in order to minimize any conflict of interest. We all take care of our buildings and businesses, and we should not penalize ourselves because we serve on this board. Mr. Perry noted that we need to get the city's concurrence that they won't be taking a portion of the grant for fees. There are always improvements to be made and these are our tax monies too.

Mr. Weatherford questioned what Chair Gemelke meant by encouraging people to apply.

Chair Gemelke explained that these are $5,000 micro grants. We also need to determine whether or not the city will waive fees. The following are topics he would like the board to address.

- Should someone be allowed to apply who owns the building and not the business inside the building?
- Should we require applicants to be a business that is already established and open to the public?
- Should someone who only has their business license be allowed to apply?
- Must in be exterior improvements only?

Chair Gemelke spoke with Mr. Vassalotti and confirmed once we have a process set up, the city could pay quickly. We could even pay the contractor directly and bypass the owner.

Mr. Weatherford recalled the 2009 Main Street Makeover project which was similar to this project. He also noted it was around the time Park State Bank offered 40 year loans at 2.5% for business owners to maintain and even improve their buildings.

Chair Gemelke noted that we discussed the loan idea as well as the idea of a matching grant program. However, he does not want to limit people from being able to come and benefit from this process.

Mr. Cabrera suggested we identify our true definition of blight and what those issues are and how people can improve their buildings based on those issues. It would give applicants an outline of what they can look to improve.

Mr. Perry noted that were not talking about a large amount of money. He agreed that it must be exterior improvements, but he does not believe we need to define it. The building owner will come to us with their budget and line items. In 2009 there were many business and building owners that participated in this similar construct. He noted we should align with the concept of reimbursing upon verification of the work done. We could put a suggestive list together however, most business owners may have a more extensive idea of what they could do to improve their buildings. He does not believe we need to require the building owner own the business as well however, if they are leasing, they must get concurrence of the building owner to participate. We do need to discuss if someone comes and they don't have matching money but they make their case that their improvements could help the downtown district. Mr. Perry noted the good side of 2009 was the city tried to minimize the bureaucracy and minimize fees on improvements business owners needed to make during that hard time.

Mr. Good suggested we recommend this to the Vos building.

Chair Gemelke noted they are welcome to apply but that is why he questioned if we require it to be an existing business with a business license that is open to the public.

Mr. Perry agrees that the Vos building owners are welcomed to apply. The bigger picture is the overall appearance of the downtown district.

Chair Gemelke recommended that we vote as a board project by project. He also noted that he verified with the attorney and the city that we are legally allowed to be offering this grant.

Mr. Perry added that this is another tool in the DDA tool chest. He and Chair Gemelke will have something tangible that Chair Gemelke can present to each member one on one for feedback and modifications. He believes there are going to be multiple businesses that come online in the next 120 days and he recommends they take advantage of this project if they see fit.

Mr. Mijares agreed that we need to get a document that defines our intent is our next step.

Mr. Perry suggested we include a deadline on the applications and an expectation of completion time.

Mr. Mijares agreed a deadline for completion should be in place.

Mr. Perry added that in tandem with this project we could do an informational campaign communicating to building and business owners to make improvements to their buildings.

Ms. Miller added that we are a small community and when an application comes in it should be blind, so board members are not aware of who the owner is. She also suggested another party look at the application. That shows an appearance of transparency. She also agrees that no one should be penalized because they serve on this board. They do a blind judging at the Workforce Center when they give out grants.

Mr. Perry agreed with the idea of another group looking at the applications. He believes it may be difficult to make it blind since we live in such a small community it may become apparent who the business is.

8. PUBLIC COMMENT REGARDING NEW BUSINESS

None

9. Reports

a. Board Chair Report

None

b. Treasurer Report

Mr. Perry noted we had no bills this month. He is attempting to make contact with the Trailridge entity as that is the final TIF payment for the year. Mr. Vassalotti provided information regarding our bonds with Vectra. Mr. Vassalotti and the city will also be providing some debt service information in order to put together pro forma. The pro forma will reveal what reserve monies we can use to participate in projects like Bergstrom Park. By the November meeting we will have the pro forma if not before then for board members to review.

c. Board Member Reports

None

d. City Attorney's Report

None

10. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Born moved adjournment 8:43 a.m.

DDA Grant Disbursement Check Request from City

To: Finance Director, City of Woodland Park

From: Downtown Development Authority

Subject: TIF Reimbursement

Meeting Approval Date:	06-06-2024
Payable To:	Woodland Park Associates
Reference:	TIF Reimbursement
Reimbursement Amount:	$58,865.95
Reimbursement GL:	
V#:	
Invoice Received:	

Note: Payment reviewed by City and DDA Attorney:

Chair/Vice-Chair

Jon Gemelke	Jon Gemelke	10/30/2024
Print Name	Signed	Date

Treasurer/Secretary

Tony L. Perry	[signature]	10/30/2024
Print Name	Signed	Date

Teller Treasurer
Receipt of Tax Payment

Account	Parcel Number	Receipt Date	Receipt Number
R0055382	6331.193400010	Apr 29, 2024	2024-04-29-DM-172037

WOODLAND PARK ASSOCIATES LLC
3200 WEST MARKET STREET, SUITE 200
FAIRLAWN , OH 44333

Situs Address
704 STONE PARK LN

Payor
WOODLAND PARK ASSOCIATES LLC
3200 WEST MARKET STREET, SUITE 200
FAIRLAWN , OH 44333

Legal Description
L1 TRAIL RIDGE SUBDIVISION

Property Code		Actual	Assessed	Year	Area	Mill Levy
9 UNITS & UP - RES	- 1125	687,364	46,050	2023	63	75.1143
9 UNITS & UP RES	- 1225	23,351,471	1,564,550	2023	63	75.1143

Payments Received

Check $120,702.68

Check # 1192

Payor fb tax management llc 1 n lasalle st 2100 chicago il 60602
312 777 6061 woodlan park associates llc

Payments Applied

Year	Charges	Billed	Prior Payments	New Payments	Balance
2023	Tax	$120,702.68	$0.00	$120,702.68	$0.00
				$120,702.68	$0.00
		Balance Due as of Apr 29, 2024			**$0.00**

ALL CHECKS ARE SUBJECT TO FINAL COLLECTION.

Thank you for your payment!

Teller County Treasurer
101 W. Bennett Ave
PO Box 367
Cripple Creek, Colorado 80813
719-689-2985

Woodland Park Associates, LLC (Trail Ridge Apartments)
Timothy Ridner
Vice President - Residential Development
Cedarwood Development
321-704-3015
tridner@cedarwoodD.com

contact in agreement:
M. P. Asset Co. LTD
Anthony A. Petrarca Trust No. VII
Andrew Duff

R0055382

	AV	base AV	AV increment	mill levy	tax increment	reimb rate	TIF reimb	paid
2017	1,011,130.00	43,230.00	967,900.00	0.0804680	77,884.98	75%	58,413.73	43000*
2018	1,013,880.00	43,230.00	970,650.00	0.0802180	77,863.60	75%	58,397.70	58,397.70
2019	1,013,880.00	43,230.00	970,650.00	0.0800850	77,734.51	75%	58,300.88	
2020		43,230.00	(43,230.00)		-	75%	-	
2021		43,230.00	(43,230.00)		-	75%	-	
2022	1,102,560.00	43,230.00	1,059,330.00	0.0807350	85,525.01	75%	64,143.76	
2023	1,048,590.00	43,230.00	1,005,360.00	0.0811410	81,575.92	50%	40,787.96	
2024	1,610,600.00	43,230.00	1,567,370.00	0.0751143	117,731.90	50%	58,865.95	
2025					-	50%	-	
2026					-	50%	-	
2027					-	25%	-	
2028					-	25%	-	
2029					-	25%	-	
2030					-	25%	-	
								58,397.70

* developer agreed to accept $43,000 in 2017; balance paid in 2018, due to base evaluation being in correct in agreement

payment to: Woodland Park Associates, LLC
Woodland Park Associates
Attn: Kathy Wilson
3200 W Market St
Suite 200
Fairlawn, OH 44333

DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

Series 2018 - Tax Increment Revenue Refunding Bonds

Capital and other expenses necessary or beneficial to the continued economic development of the downtown district. Initial drawdown of $500,000 at 4.74% interest.

	Principal (Jun 1)	Interest (Jun 1)	Total D/S	Principal O/S at Y/E
2018		10,000	10,000	500,000
2019	50,000	14,997	64,997	450,000
2020	50,000	21,667	71,667	400,000
2021	50,000	19,207	69,207	350,000
2022	50,000	16,806	66,806	300,000
2023	50,000	14,405	64,405	250,000
2024	50,000	12,037	62,037	200,000
2025	50,000	9,604	59,604	150,000
2026	50,000	7,203	57,203	100,000
2027	50,000	4,802	54,802	50,000
2028	50,000	2,407	52,407	-

DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

Series 2012 - Tax Increment Revenue Refunding Bonds

Refund Series 2008 Bonds and redevelopment projects at Tamarac Center and Woodland Station. Annual interest is 3.97%.

	Principal (Jun 1)	Interest (Jun 1)	Total D/S	Principal O/S at Y/E
2017	165,000	115,280	280,280	2,699,000
2018	175,000	108,639	283,639	2,524,000
2019	185,000	101,595	286,595	2,339,000
2020	195,000	94,406	289,406	2,144,000
2021	205,000	86,299	291,299	1,939,000
2022	215,000	78,047	293,047	1,724,000
2023	225,000	69,393	294,393	1,499,000
2024	240,000	60,502	300,502	1,259,000
2025	250,000	50,677	300,677	1,009,000
2026	265,000	40,614	305,614	744,000
2027	275,000	29,947	304,947	469,000
2028	469,000	18,930	487,930	-